

# MEDIAEVAL STUDIES

*Volume XXIV*

1962



PONTIFICAL INSTITUTE OF MEDIAEVAL STUDIES  
TORONTO, CANADA

NIHIL OBSTAT.  
ARMAND A. MAURER, C.S.B.  
*Censor Librorum*

IMPRIMATUR.  
† PHILIP F. POCKOCK  
*Archiep. Coadj. Torontinus*

*All correspondence regarding articles, subscriptions  
or orders should be addressed to*

T. P. McLaughlin, C.S.B., Managing Editor  
Mediaeval Studies  
59 Queen's Park  
TORONTO 5, CANADA

---

Reprinted in the Netherlands  
ACADEMISCHE PERS N.V. — AMSTERDAM

## CONTENTS

### ARTICLES

|   |                              |     |
|---|------------------------------|-----|
| The Liber de Differentia naturae et personae by Hugh Etherian and the letters addressed to him by Peter of Vienna and Hugh of Honau . . . . . | NICHOLAS M. HARING S.A.C.    | 1   |
| An Essay on the "Novi Cives" and Florentine Politics, 1342-1382 . . . . .   | MARVIN B. BECKER             | 35  |
| The "Miller's Tale": An Interpretation . . . . .  | W. F. BOLTON                 | 83  |
| Gervase of Tilbury's Addenda to his "Otia Imperialia" . . . . .   | JAMES R. CALDWELL            | 95  |
| Chaucer's "Cursed Monk", Constantinus Africanus . . . . .   | MAURICE BASSAN               | 127 |
| The "Castle of Perseverance": Redactions, Place, and Date . . . . .   | JACOB BENNETT                | 141 |
| A Twelfth Century Oxford Disputation Concerning the Privileges of the Knights Hospitallers . . . . .  | JAMES A. BRUNDAGE            | 153 |
| The Mediaeval Medical School at Cambridge . . . . .   | VERN L. BULLOUGH             | 161 |
| Theos and the One in Some Texts of Plotinus . . . . .   | JOHN M. RIST                 | 169 |
| The Porretans and the Greek Fathers . . . . .   | NICHOLAS M. HARING S.A.C.    | 181 |
| The Marriages and the Wealth of the Wife of Bath . . . . .  | CECILE STOLLER MARGULIES     | 210 |
| The Noah Story in Cursor Mundi (vv. 1625-1916) . . . . .  | J. J. LAMBERTS               | 217 |
| The Sources and Meaning of Bernard Silvester's Commentary on the Aeneid . . . . .   | J. REGINALD O'DONNELL C.S.B. | 233 |
| Sixteen Sayings by Richard of Campsall on Contingency and Foreknowledge . . . . .   | EDWARD A. SYNAN              | 250 |
| The Constitution "Cum ex eo" of Boniface VIII: Education of Parochial Clergy . . . . .  | LEONARD E. BOYLE O.P.        | 263 |

|  |                          |     |
|--|--------------------------|-----|
| Analogy as a Thomistic Approach to Being . . . . .                                   | JOSEPH OWENS C.Ss.R.     | 303 |
| On a Handlist of Saints' Lives in Old Norse . . . . .                                | HANS BEKKER-NIELSEN      | 323 |
| The Date of the "Apocalypse of Paul"   | THEODORE SILVERSTEIN     | 335 |
| Marc Bloch's Comparative Method and the Rural History of Mediaeval England . . . . . | J. AMBROSE RAFTIS C.S.B. | 349 |

## MEDIAEVALIA

|  |                           |     |
|--|---------------------------|-----|
| The Source of Chaucer's "Rusted Gold" . . . . .  | EDWARD L. BODE            | 369 |
| The Use of William of Moerbeke's Recension of the "Posterior Analytics": A Second Instance .   | BRUCE BRASWELL            | 371 |
| Minsheu's "Guide into the Tongues" and Somner's "Dictionarium" .   | SISTER MARY JOAN R.S.M.   | 375 |
| Thomas Wimbeldon . . . . .   | NANCY H. OWEN             | 377 |
| Chaucer's "Throstil Old" and Other Birds . . . . .   | BERYL ROWLAND             | 381 |
| The "Ecloga Theoduli", the "General Estoria" and the Perseus-Bellerophon Myth . . . . .  | JOHN M. STEADMAN          | 384 |
| The "Prioress's Tale" and 'Granella' of 'Paradiso' . . . . .   | JOHN M. STEADMAN          | 388 |
| Report of a Thesis Recently Defended at the Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies: The Theology of the Hypostatic Union in the Early Thirteenth Century: The Doctrines of William of Auxerre, Alexander of Hales, Hugh of Saint-Cher and Philip the Chancellor . . . . . | WALTER H. PRINCIPE C.S.B. | 392 |



# The "Liber de Differentia naturae et personae" by Hugh Etherian and the letters addressed to him by Peter of Vienna and Hugh of Honau

NICHOLAS M. HARING S. A. C.

THE discovery that Hugh Etherian composed a work *On the Difference between Nature and Person* was made more than a generation ago by Charles Homer Haskins,<sup>1</sup> who published the introduction to an anonymous Latin treatise with the very similar title: *Liber de diversitate naturae et personae*.<sup>2</sup> The author of this introduction expresses his great happiness at receiving from Hugh Etherian in Constantinople a *Libellus de diversitate naturae et personae*. "On my sojourn in the Royal City" (Constantinople), he writes, "I was happy to experience the long-yearned-for fulfilment of my plan, viz., the texts of the early holy doctors of Greece translated by Hugh Etherian, a man extremely well versed in both Greek and Latin. On this second legation of mine he handed me a little book compiled in compliance with the questions, submitted by me on my first legation, concerning the diversity of nature and person, a book supported by the *auctoritates* of Basil the Great, Gregory Nazianzen, and other saints, *auctoritates* which he had culled from the volumes of the Greeks with much diligence and care not only at my personal request but also at that of a most learned man, Peter, a schoolman in a highly flourishing town of Austria".<sup>3</sup>

The merit of discovering this "little book" goes to Fr. Antoine Dondaine<sup>4</sup> who has edited its interesting preface<sup>5</sup> from which we gather that two "very dear friends, Hugh and Peter", had prompted Hugh Etherian to compile his book. Together with Hugh's work Dondaine found three letters which enabled him to establish that a certain Hugh

<sup>1</sup> *Studies in the History of Mediaeval Science* (Cambridge, Mass. 1924) 209 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Preserved in MS Cambridge, Univ. Lib. li. 4. 27, fols. 129-178.

<sup>3</sup> Haskins, *Studies*, p. 210.

<sup>4</sup> 'Hugues Éthérien et Léon Toscan', *Arch. d'hist. doct. et litt. du M.A.* 19 (1952) 67-134.

<sup>5</sup> A fragment of this preface or rather prefatory letter is found in MS Basel, Univ. Lib. O II 24, fol. 13: (C)arissimis amicis . . . iactatam fluctibus.

of Honau in Alsace-Lorraine is the author of the tract discovered by Haskins.

It would seem that rather than *Libellus* Hugh Etherian called his compilation: *Liber de differentia naturae et personae*.<sup>6</sup> He wrote it either early in, or before, 1179 to satisfy his friends Hugh of Honau and Peter of Vienna both of whom were convinced that some Greek Fathers favoured certain views which their former professor, Gilbert of Poitiers, had expressed at the Consistory of Reims (1148). Particularly Hugh of Honau expected of the Pisan in Constantinople an answer to a long list of questions<sup>7</sup> the first of which was: "whether nature and person are identical." Although Master Peter of Vienna has no such long list of questions, he, too, is primarily interested in obtaining the translation of the *auctoritates* of the Greek theologians who, as Peter maintains, "point out more clearly than our own that reason must distinguish between nature and person" (in God).<sup>8</sup>

Hugh Etherian's *Liber* by no means answers the entire questionnaire submitted to him by Hugh of Honau but concentrates on the teaching of some Greek Fathers concerning the difference between nature and person. In his prefatory letter Hugh Etherian states: *Excussi quoque inter personam naturamque dividendi rationem ex Graecorum copiis*.<sup>9</sup> Personally, he is perhaps less certain than his two friends,<sup>10</sup> "for the divinity is an unknown and incomprehensible nature."<sup>11</sup> Hugh also points out that the Greeks do not designate the three Persons as *res naturae* nor do they call the divinity a *natura rei*. The Greeks, as Hugh Etherian sees it, fear that such philosophical terminology may lead to wrong conclusions on the theological level. He adds that the Greeks employ the words 'divinity' and 'God' only to signify the divine nature.<sup>12</sup>

#### ANALYSIS OF THE LIBER DE DIFFERENTIA AND ITS SOURCES

After these preliminary remarks, Hugh Etherian introduces "a man of great holiness, Anastasius," defining the meaning of the word 'nature'. Anastasius Sinaita who died shortly after 700 was an ardent

<sup>6</sup> No title is given in the fragment preserved at Basel.

<sup>7</sup> Dondaine, p. 129, lines 37 ff.

<sup>8</sup> *Gesta Fred.* I, 56; MGH SS 20, 383, line 12.

<sup>9</sup> *De Differentia*, 6.

<sup>10</sup> *De Differentia*, 7: *Vestra propositio, qua secundum artium methodon a natura differre ostenditis personas, satis probabilitatis habet.*

<sup>11</sup> *Ibidem*.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibidem*.

defender of the Church against Nestorians, Monophysites, and Monothelites. Hugh made use of the *Viae Dux* in which Anastasius deals at length with the relationship between nature and person. As a rule, Anastasius contrasts *physis* and *prósōpon* as not identical.<sup>13</sup> He declares that in ecclesiastical language *physis*, *usia*, *génos* and *morphé* all have the same meaning,<sup>14</sup> whereas *hypóstasis*, *prósōpon*, *charactér*, *ídion*, and *átomon* all mean 'person' in ecclesiastical terminology.<sup>15</sup> In his translation, Hugh Etherian generally uses the terms *natura* and *persona*; but it is sometimes difficult to differentiate between the translation and Hugh's own remarks.

There is, for example, no doubt that the first passage from Anastasius: *Natura est vera rei existentia . . . per phantasiam intelligitur*<sup>16</sup> is derived from the *Viae Dux*.<sup>17</sup> Hugh then continues: *Et notandum, inquit, quod natura et substantia idem apud ecclesiae doctores significant.*<sup>18</sup> One may rightly wonder whether this statement is likewise taken from Anastasius. The fact that Hugh of Honau<sup>19</sup> quotes this sentence without the *inquit* strengthens the suspicion that Hugh Etherian suddenly speaks of the Latin use of *natura* and *substantia*. The assertion that "the doctors of the Church" employ those terms in the same sense is true of the Latin Fathers but not compatible with what Anastasius has to say concerning Greek terminology.

The sentence which follows is introduced by *Et rursus*, a device often used by mediaeval authors to announce another quotation. Yet here again it is difficult if not practically impossible for the Latin reader to differentiate between the translation and Hugh's personal explanation. That this difficulty is insurmountable for readers who have no access to the Greek original needs no stressing. For that reason, special care should have been taken by Hugh to indicate exactly both the beginning and the end of a quotation. There seems to be no doubt that the sentence: *Ex quo utique . . . non esse idem*<sup>20</sup> is Hugh's own. But how was a reader to know this unless he could compare the version with the original.

The examples given to illustrate the Scriptural usage are all derived from Anastasius and Hugh's personal comment is freely mixed with that

<sup>13</sup> See especially *Viae Dux*, 8; PG 89, 127B-134A.

<sup>14</sup> *Viae Dux*, 2; PG 89, 57A.

<sup>15</sup> *Viae Dux*, 2; PG 89, 60A.

<sup>16</sup> *De Diff.*, 8.

<sup>17</sup> *Viae Dux*, 2; PG 89, 55D.

<sup>18</sup> *De Diff.*, 8.

<sup>19</sup> *Lib. de div. naturae et personae*; MS Cambridge, Univ. Lib. li. 4. 27, fol. 145.

<sup>20</sup> *De Diff.*, 8.

of Anastasius Sinaita.<sup>21</sup> The subject often changes without mention. Thus the subject of *assumit* is Anastasius, of *vocavit* Moses.<sup>22</sup> Conversely, in the next chapter the subject of *dixit* is St. James, of *subiungit* Anastasius, of *ait* St. Paul.<sup>23</sup> The introduction to the next set of Scriptural texts reads: *Et idem rursus vir*.<sup>24</sup> This 'man', no doubt, is Anastasius Sinaita, but what follows is a rather free handling of his source by Hugh Etherian who, on at least two occasions, omits the all important conclusion made by Anastasius: "Therefore, person and nature are not the same."<sup>25</sup>

The second *auctoritas* quoted by Hugh is a sentence found in *quodam sermone*<sup>26</sup> by Gregory of Nyssa (d. 394). It is actually copied from a tract called *De communibus notionibus*.<sup>27</sup> The excerpt is accompanied by Hugh's comment which begins with *singulariter*.

The next passage is attributed to St. Cyril in *quodam ad Hermiam sermone*.<sup>28</sup> The work is known as *A Dialogue on the Most Holy Trinity*<sup>29</sup> but was hardly Hugh's immediate source. The first sentence appears to be a free translation of a short statement attributed to St. Cyril (*Ad Hermiam*) by Anastasius Sinaita.<sup>30</sup> The next sentence (*Ecce infinitae personae . . . una universi*) is found in the previous chapter of the *Viae Dux*.<sup>31</sup>

The assertion that "the Holy Synod of Nicea" would have wrongly deposed Sabellius if nature and person in God were identical is also made by Anastasius.<sup>32</sup> The same Anastasius accounts for the next sentence: *Item, si natura persona . . . eiusdem deitatis*,<sup>33</sup> found in the same context in the *Viae Dux*.<sup>34</sup> After a short personal comment (*qui utique . . . inveniantur naturae*), Hugh returns again to Anastasius without saying anything to mark the transition.

<sup>21</sup> *De Diff.*, 9-11.

<sup>22</sup> *De Diff.*, 9.

<sup>23</sup> *De Diff.*, 10.

<sup>24</sup> *De Diff.*, 11.

<sup>25</sup> After *peccaverat* and *fratrum suorum*.

<sup>26</sup> *De Diff.*, 12.

<sup>27</sup> PG 45, 182A.

<sup>28</sup> *De Diff.*, 13: In *quodam ad Hermiam sermone*. Cf. *De sancto et imm. Deo* I, 14 and II, 18; PL 202, 257D and 328A.

<sup>29</sup> PG 75, 659-1124.

<sup>30</sup> *Viae Dux*, 9; PG 89, 146C.

<sup>31</sup> *Viae Dux*, 8; PG 89, 126A.

<sup>32</sup> *Viae Dux*, 9; PG 89, 143A.

<sup>33</sup> *Viae Dux*, 9; PG 89, 143A.

<sup>34</sup> PG 89, 143A.

The conclusion that through this lack of clear differentiation Hugh's compilation was apt to mislead its readers is hardly an exaggeration, though it would not be fair to accuse him of deliberately misleading them. It would rather seem that Hugh did not have time to polish his material and put it in better logical or chronological order.<sup>35</sup> A case in point is the adverb *ecce* we find after the first sentence attributed to St. Cyril (d. 444). Most of Hugh's contemporaries would interpret the *ecce* as an indication that the quotation was ended. As employed in this particular case it was impossible for a reader to know that the succeeding statements date back to the *Viae Dux* of Anastasius Sinaita.

Hugh Etherian then returns to St. Gregory of Nyssa.<sup>36</sup> The first text is supposedly taken from a writing *Ad Aulalium* which is a corruption of *Ad Ablabium* to whom St. Gregory addressed a treatise dealing with the Holy Trinity.<sup>37</sup> However, the sentence quoted by Hugh is not found there. It is copied from a short work by Gregory called *De Fide ad Simplicium*.<sup>38</sup> The next quotation (*Et iterum: Una... quod est proprium*) is not derived from this work. If it is a genuine quotation, as is strongly suggested by the *Et iterum*, I have not been able to identify it. The same holds for the first part of the next quote beginning with *Amplius* which after three non-identified sentences incorporates a long passage from Gregory of Nyssa's *De communibus notionibus*.<sup>39</sup> Hugh does not tell us that he omitted some sentences<sup>40</sup> within the passage, as other authors would probably have done by saying: *Et paulo post* or *Et post pauca*.

In the following paragraph Hugh introduces a "philosopher" as saying: *Divina natura trium personarum forma est*.<sup>41</sup> A more accurate indication of the sources is given for the passages translated from St. Basil (d. 379). The first of them is taken from St. Basil's letter to Count

<sup>35</sup> Milton V. Anastos, 'Some Aspects of Byzantine Influence on Latin Thought', Marshall Clagett et al., *Twelfth-Century Europe and the Foundation of Modern Society* (Madison, 1961) 142, passes the following judgement on Hugh's *De sancto et imm. Deo*: "In spite of his great erudition, however, Hugo does not present an argument that can be redressed to a logical outline... Instead, in the manner of compilers of *catenae* and *excerpta*, Hugo piles topic on to topic without attempting to subordinate or link one to another." Hugh's *De Differentia* adds new evidence to this impression.

<sup>36</sup> *De Diff.*, 14.

<sup>37</sup> PG 45, 115-136. In his *De sancto et imm. Deo* III, 12 f. (Pl 202, 364D; 367A), Hugh quotes *Ad Aulalium* three times and accurately: PG 45, 134BC; 135A.

<sup>38</sup> PG 45, 142B.

<sup>39</sup> PG 45, 175C-178A: At non... duae humanitates.

<sup>40</sup> Between *et tres dii* and *Etenim neque Petrum... duae humanitates*.

<sup>41</sup> *De Diff.*, 15

Terence<sup>42</sup> in which it is stated that *hypostasis* and *usia* are not the same. Hugh's translation adheres closely to the original but it is worth noting that now the words *hypostasis* and *usia* appear instead of *persona* and *natura*. In the second excerpt St. Basil deals with the same question as in the first.<sup>43</sup> The translation follows the original to the sentence: Credo in Deum Patrem. The rest is only a summary of what follows in St Basil's letter. The third excerpt, attributed to St. Basil, *Against Eunomius*,<sup>44</sup> is followed by two definitions of *hypostasis* which may also be derived from the same work.<sup>45</sup> The passage beginning with: Vocatur autem hypostasis, ut quidam dicit, "individuum", is vague in the sense that the remark *ut quidam dicit* might be St. Basil's or Hugh's own reference to another writer. Hugh of Honau<sup>46</sup> took it to be part of the paragraph attributed to S. Basil, *Against Eunomius*.

It is hardly erroneous to assume that the next writer, Theodorus Abucaras,<sup>47</sup> was a complete and perfect stranger to Latin theologians. Theodore Abu Qurra, born in Edessa, wrote a number of tractates against Monophysitism in the first quarter of the ninth century.<sup>48</sup> The second of Hugh's two excerpts is a translation of a text taken from Theodore's second *opusculum*. The first excerpt is much more difficult to place. It resembles an argument found in the *Viae Dux* of Anastasius Sinaita.<sup>49</sup>

Theodore Abu Qurra is followed by St. John Damascene (d. 749?).<sup>50</sup> Hugh, as might be expected, made his own translations of the excerpts. Yet he must have been aware of the version made by the Pisan Burgundio in 1153-4.<sup>51</sup>

The "philosopher" or rather lover of wisdom quoted after St. John Damascene shows his familiarity with Aristotle's definition of nature and reasons very much like a Latin theologian.

Hugh Etherian now returns to Anastasius Sinaita.<sup>52</sup> After a fairly accurate rendition of sentences found in various contexts of the *Viae*

<sup>42</sup> *De Diff.*, 16: *Ep.* 214, 4; PG 32, 790B.

<sup>43</sup> *De Diff.*, 17: *Ep.* 236, 6 (to Amphilochius); PG 32, 883A.

<sup>44</sup> *De Diff.*, 18.

<sup>45</sup> *Adv. Eunomium* II, 4; PG 29, 578C-579A. Cf. *Ep.* 38, 6; PG 32, 335D.

<sup>46</sup> *Lib. de div.* XVIII, 6; fol. 143.

<sup>47</sup> *De Diff.*, 19.

<sup>48</sup> See Hans-Georg Beck, *Kirche und theol. Lit. im byzantinischen Reich* (Munich, 1959) 488-489. O. Bardenheuer, *Gesch. der altk. Literatur* 5 (Freiburg, 1932) 65.

<sup>49</sup> *Viae Dux*, 8; PG 89, 126A.

<sup>50</sup> *De Diff.*, 20-27.

<sup>51</sup> Ed. E. M. Buytaert in *Franciscan Institute Publications* 8 (Louvain, 1955).

<sup>52</sup> *De Diff.*, 30.

*Dux*, Hugh himself becomes the narrator saying: At venerabilis vitae Anastasius protulit . . .<sup>53</sup> In the same manner he states later on: Induxit quoque sancti Procli auctoritatem . . .<sup>54</sup> What follows is derived from Anastasius. But here again a confusion occurs which can hardly be explained by scribal error. The text beginning with *Quare inquit Anastasius* and ending with *humanitas et similia*<sup>55</sup> is found in John Damascene's *De Natura composita*.<sup>56</sup> It is, of course, possible that the work or at least Hugh's copy of it was attributed to Anastasius. Its authenticity is not quite firmly established.<sup>57</sup> However, without indicating a different source Hugh concludes the texts from the *De Natura composita* with a passage from the *Viae Dux*.<sup>58</sup>

It seems that what we read in the next paragraph is Hugh's own reflection on the subject.<sup>59</sup> He then declares that "the saints" used *hypostasis* sometimes to designate substance or nature and sometimes to signify an individual.<sup>60</sup> It is of interest to note here that Hugh of Honau cites this paragraph with the introduction: Unde Anastasius in *Disputatione contra Nestorianos*.<sup>61</sup> Although Anastasius mentions in his *Viae Dux* that he wrote at length against Nestorius,<sup>62</sup> the work has not survived. Moreover, no such work is attributed to Anastasius in Hugh Etherian's *Liber de differentia* in the form in which we possess it. Since Hugh of Honau quotes his sources with the utmost care and accuracy the attribution may be due to some variants in the transmission of the *Liber de differentia*.

It is likely that Hugh Etherian translated the next passage from the *De Natura composita* rather than from its original source, the letter to Cledonius by St. Gregory of Nazianzus.<sup>63</sup> Otherwise he might have mentioned that the text was copied from a letter. The scribal confusion of Anastasius with Athanasius which occurs in the succeeding excerpt from St. Gregory of Nazianzus is not rare in the Middle Ages.

The first of the numerous quotations which now follow<sup>64</sup> was known

<sup>53</sup> *De Diff.*, 32.

<sup>54</sup> *De Diff.*, 32.

<sup>55</sup> *De Diff.*, 34-36.

<sup>56</sup> PG 95, 111-126.

<sup>57</sup> See Bardenhewer, *Gesch.*, p. 58.

<sup>58</sup> *De Diff.*, 37. *Viae Dux*, 8; PG 89, 131C.

<sup>59</sup> *De Diff.*, 38.

<sup>60</sup> *De Diff.*, 39.

<sup>61</sup> *Lib. de div.* XVI, 2; fol. 141<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>62</sup> *Viae Dux*, 4; PG 89, 97C.

<sup>63</sup> *De Diff.*, 40; *De nat. comp.*, 7; PG 95, 122B. Gregory Naz., *Ep.* 101; PG 37, 179A.

<sup>64</sup> *De Diff.*, 41-42.

to Latin authors through the Rufinus translation,<sup>65</sup> but Hugh Etherian made his own version. We should also note on this occasion that Hugh was not quite unfamiliar with the customary way of presenting short quotes from patristic sources. After quoting a sentence from Gregory's *Discourse on the Holy Spirit*<sup>66</sup> he links several other sentences from the same *Discourse* with such familiar formulas as: *Et post modicum . . . Et post paululum . . . Et iterum.*

Our Pisan does not insinuate that the next paragraph<sup>67</sup> is from a different author. It is copied from the *Viae Dux* of Anastasius Sinaita. The last *auctoritas*<sup>68</sup> quoted by Hugh Etherian is taken from the first decree found in the *Codex* of the Emperor Justinian (527-565).<sup>69</sup> In view of this last *auctoritas* we understand how Hugh came to the conclusion that we violate both the Imperial Constitution and all the other *auctoritates* if we affirm that person is nature or that nature is person. Thus Hugh Etherian sides with Gilbert and his school against those who maintained that, in thinking of God, reason must not distinguish between nature and person.

The fact that Hugh Etherian's work suffers from several serious weaknesses undoubtedly limited its usefulness to Latin theologians. A more orderly presentation of the Greek *auctoritates* would have greatly improved the value of, and confidence in, the compilation. Perhaps much more serious was the frequently noticeable lack of a clear distinction between quotations and Hugh's own comments on them. It must also be kept in mind that such names as Theodorus Abucaras and Leontius Byzantinus were entirely unknown to most if not all Latin theologians. Where Hugh of Honau describes Anastasius (Sinaita) as *vir magnae sanctitatis apud Graecos* he not only echoes the words of Hugh Etherian but also reveals that he knew nothing else about this Greek theologian. But at least the name Anastasius was familiar. This cannot be said of Theodorus Abucaras and Leontius Byzantinus. No wonder then that they are not even mentioned by Hugh of Honau although he believed both in the quality and the quantity of patristic quotations. Hugh of Honau who definitely used the *Liber de differentia naturae et personae* made use of his source with great caution as is borne out by the fact that, apart from Anastasius, he copied from the *Liber*

<sup>65</sup> *De Luminibus* II, 4; CSEL 46, 121.

<sup>66</sup> *De Diff.*, 42.

<sup>67</sup> *De Diff.*, 43.

<sup>68</sup> *De Diff.*, 45.

<sup>69</sup> Justinian is quoted twice in *De sancto et imm. Deo* III, 16; PL 202, 375C.



only St. Basil (or rather what he gathered to be quotations from St. Basil) and St. Gregory of Nyssa (*Ad Aulalium*).

These remarks should not detract from the deep significance of Hugh Etherian's effort in the wider context of mediaeval thought.<sup>70</sup> This has been well stated by O. Lottin: "L'intérêt doctrinal des écrits de Hugues Éthérien n'est pas tant dans sa réfutation des erreurs des Grecs<sup>71</sup> que dans le fait qu'un disciple de Gilbert de la Porrée du XII<sup>e</sup> siècle compte Hugues parmi les membres de l'école porrétaïne".<sup>72</sup> And after pointing out that, in 1607, Hugh Etherian's principal work was put on the *Index*, A. Dondaine notes: "Le vocabulaire théologique de Hugues n'est pas seulement inspiré des Grecs, il a aussi une saveur porrétaïne".<sup>73</sup> Even more important, no doubt, was the deep respect for the Greek Fathers with which Gilbert had imbued his students.

Three valuable letters found together with Hugh Etherian's *Liber de differentia* furnish highly interesting information regarding the circumstances leading to the composition of this work.

#### THE AUTHOR

Hugh Etherian,<sup>74</sup> born in Pisa, probably in the second decade of the eleventh century, studied first in Italy and then went to France where, among other subjects, he studied philosophy (*dialectica*) under a "certain Alberic". Hugh of Honau writes of Hugh Etherian "I myself have heard him say that when he was in France he followed the lectures in philosophy of a certain Alberic and, in theology, attended the run-of-the-mill courses delivered by men far removed from our methods of carrying on studies. He said that when he had to translate into Latin various texts from the men just mentioned<sup>75</sup> and from other excellent doctors of Greece he gave up the view<sup>76</sup> which he had taken with him from Gaul and Italy into Achaia."<sup>77</sup> This text shows clearly that the Pisan stayed

<sup>70</sup> M. V. Anastos, 'Some Aspects', p. 148 states: "Hugo's chief contribution to Latin theology lay in his conscientious study of Byzantine patristic literature."

<sup>71</sup> Hugh's *De sancto et imm. Deo* (PL 202, 227-396) is generally hailed as the first scientific Latin answer to the Greek doctrine on the Procession of the Holy Spirit.

<sup>72</sup> *Bull. de théol. anc. et méd.* 7 (1954-7) 97, no. 457.

<sup>73</sup> 'Hugh Éthérien et Léon Toscan', p. 104, n. 1.

<sup>74</sup> The *agnomen* Etherianus (Aetherianus, Eterianus, Heterianus), as A. Dondaine (p. 73) suggests, may indicate that Hugh was once a member of the *hetairia*, a military corps at the Imperial Palace in Constantinople.

<sup>75</sup> Basil and Gregory Nazianzen.

<sup>76</sup> The view that nature and person are one in God.

<sup>77</sup> *Lib. de div.*; fol. 130<sup>v</sup>. Haskins, *Studies*, p. 210: Qui cum, ut ipso confitente audivi,

away from the lectures given at the time by the Bishop of Poitiers and followed what Hugh of Honau describes as "the run-of-the-mill courses" delivered by those who disagreed in theology with Gilbert's teaching methods and with Gilbert's view concerning the distinction between nature and person in God. However, at a later date, most likely in the late seventies of his century, Hugh Etherian changed his mind in favour of Gilbert when he was urged to translate into Latin certain texts in which Greek Fathers advocated such a distinction.

It is not known at what date Hugh of Pisa went to Constantinople,<sup>78</sup> but we learn from his brother Leo<sup>79</sup> that he wrote a *Libellus de Filii hominis minoritate ad Patrem Deum*<sup>80</sup> which helped the Emperor Manuel I in settling, at the Synod<sup>81</sup> of Constantinople in 1166, the controversy concerning the proper interpretation of Christ's words: *My Father is greater than I* (Jn 14:28). Early in 1167, Hugh wrote to his friend Master Peter of Vienna a letter in which he reveals that the Emperor summoned him to the Palace one evening to learn from him what the Roman Church was teaching on the controversial issue.<sup>82</sup> When it became known that the Emperor favoured Hugh's exposition, the nobles at the court, three of whom "were considered philosophers," began to debate with the Pisan. One of them "brought Eutyches back from hell" by quoting St. Gregory the Theologian to the effect that "Christ's flesh is that which is God". The crowd grew larger and noisier, but in a moment of quiet Hugh succeeded in explaining the meaning of Gregory's saying. Both the Emperor and "the more select part of the nobles" agreed with Hugh's explanation. The lively debate lasted until about "the third watch". For several days people kept arguing the point. However, the Emperor, the first Bishop of the city,<sup>83</sup> and a few of his fellow bishops stayed firm while the vast majority of the clergy, the monks, and the people stood for the opposite view.

Alberici cuiusdam in dialecticis fuisset auditor in Francia aliorumque a studiis nostris in theologia dissidentium viam publicam trivisset, praefatorum virorum et aliorum clarissimorum Graeciae doctorum coactus est in Latinum transferre sermonem unde suam propriam, quam de Gallia et Italia in Achaïam detulerat, convinceret opinionem.

<sup>78</sup> P. Classen, "Das Konzil von Konstantinopel 1166 und die Lateiner," *Byz. Zeitschr.* 48 (1955) 342, states that he went there before 1161.

<sup>79</sup> See Leo's preface to the *Oneirocriticon* in Haskins, *Studies*, p. 217.

<sup>80</sup> The work as found by A. Dondaine in MS Tarragona, Bibl. Prov. 92, fols. 176-187<sup>v</sup>, is divided into two *libelli*.

<sup>81</sup> The Acts are found in PG 144, 201-282.

<sup>82</sup> A. Dondaine, 'Hugues Éthérien et le concile de Constantinople de 1166', *Hist. Jahrb.* 77(1958) 481.

<sup>83</sup> Hugh means the Patriarch Lukas Chrysoberges (1157-1169) who was widely disliked as "a friend of the Latins". Cf. P. Classen, p. 343.

Finally, the Emperor convoked a synod which opened on March 2, 1166. It ended with a compromise as Hugh himself admits in a letter to Master Peter of Vienna: *Non tamen nominatissimus Moderator impellere contrariam partem valuit ut Christum secundum humanitatem Patre minorem esse asserat, quamquam Patrem eo maiorem secundum eandem humanitatem firmiter fateatur.*<sup>84</sup>

It has been suggested that in the month of May, 1166, Master Peter of Vienna accompanied Count Henry Jasomirgott of Austria (1156-77) on a journey to Constantinople<sup>85</sup> and that on this occasion Peter asked Hugh Etherian for information regarding the problem debated at the synod. Because of his clashes with Gerhoch of Reichersberg's christological views Peter was quite anxious to know exactly how the controversy was settled. But Hugh, it seems, was too busy to provide an immediate answer in writing. Before March of the following year, however, the Pisan sent Master Peter a detailed report and a copy of the first *Libellus de Filii hominis minoritate* written by him at the Emperor's request.<sup>86</sup> He also sent a report to another Latin correspondent and added a detailed description of the various opinions held by the Greeks, the text of the profession of faith made by the three Patriarchs attending the synod, and the text of the canons issued by the synod.<sup>87</sup> This addition was later copied by Gerhoch of Reichersberg<sup>88</sup> who some ten years earlier had been accused by Master Peter of similar exaggerations in Christology. When Gerhoch read Hugh's *Libellus* he denounced it as having been written *secundum humanam philosophiam et secundum elementa mundi contra Christi sive assumpti in Deum hominis divinam gloriam.*<sup>89</sup>

The Imperial summons to the Palace in 1166 shows that Hugh was already well known in Constantinople, though we know from his letter to Master Peter that he and the other Latins in Constantinople were hated and detested.<sup>90</sup> The Pisans had long established a colony in the

<sup>84</sup> A. Dondaine, p. 481.

<sup>85</sup> This conjecture is made by P. Classen, *Gerhoch v. Reichersberg* (Wiesbaden, 1960) 302. Master Peter was in the service (*de ordine capellanorum*) of Count Henry, as is borne out by a charter issued in Vienna on April 22, 1161. See H. Fichtenau and E. Zöllner, *Urkundenbuch zur Gesch. der Babenberger in Österreich* 1 (Vienna, 1950) 44, n. 29.

<sup>86</sup> The concluding chapter is transcribed by A. Dondaine, 'H. Éthérien et le concile', pp. 482-483.

<sup>87</sup> A. Dondaine, p. 478.

<sup>88</sup> Edited by P. Classen, 'Das Konzil', pp. 364-368.

<sup>89</sup> Classen, 'Das Konzil', p. 346. Gerhoch (p. 346) speaks of: Ugo Enterianus in libro quem ad Imperatorem Graecorum contra Demetrium, catholicae fidei defensorem, scripsit.

<sup>90</sup> He writes to Peter: *Commonstrabamur equidem in civitate invisi et detestati* (Dondaine, p. 481).

Imperial city and when, in 1161, Pisa continued to side with Frederic Barbarossa they were ordered out of their homes and deprived of their privileges.<sup>91</sup> The order was not rescinded until July 1170. These circumstances permit us to conclude that Hugh must have been in Constantinople for a considerable period of time before the synod of 1166.<sup>92</sup> At the same time Hugh's younger brother, Leo, acted as *imperatoriarum epistolarum interpres*.<sup>93</sup>

One reason why the Emperor Manuel took such an active interest in theology was to remove if possible the troublesome doctrinal divergencies between East and West. His broader object was a political union. One major issue dividing East and West was the doctrine of the Procession of the Holy Spirit. The Greeks argued that the Fathers taught a Procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father only, while the West strongly defended as traditional the doctrine that the Holy Spirit proceeds from both Father and Son.

Hugh tells us that while he was in Constantinople the Emperor Manuel called and asked him whether the Latins had any *auctoritates* "of the saints" to support their claim. Without hesitation Hugh named "Basil, Athanasius, and Cyril".<sup>94</sup> At the Emperor's request Hugh then undertook to write, together with his brother Leo, his most important work: *De sancto et immortalī Deo*.<sup>95</sup> He was also encouraged to write it by Hubald,<sup>96</sup> Cardinal-Bishop of Ostia (1159-81), Bernard,<sup>97</sup> Cardinal-Bishop of Porto, and John,<sup>98</sup> Titular Cardinal of Saints John and Paul.<sup>99</sup> When the book was finished, Hugh sent a copy through Master Caciareda to Alexander III (1159-81)<sup>1</sup> who, on November 6, 1177, acknowledged

<sup>91</sup> F. Chalandon, *Les Comnène* II, 2 (Paris 1912) 574-575. A. A. Vasiliev, *History of the Byzantine Empire* (Madison, 1952) 486.

<sup>92</sup> A. Dondaine, 'H. Éthérien et Léon Toscan', p. 81, estimates "dix ans et plus".

<sup>93</sup> See his preface to the *Oneirocriticon* in Haskins, *Studies*, p. 217.

<sup>94</sup> PL 202, 233A. Quotations are given in cols. 328A (Basil), 327C (Athanasius), 328A (Cyril). Concerning the controversial text from St. Basil, see M. Jugie, *De Proc. Sp. sancti* (Rome, 1936) 152.

<sup>95</sup> PL 202, 233C-369D. The title *De Haeresibus quas Graeci in Latinos devolunt* is not authentic. Cf. Dondaine, pp. 114-116.

<sup>96</sup> Later Pope Lucius III (1181-1185).

<sup>97</sup> Created by Hadrian IV (1154-9), he signed papal documents from Jan. 29, 1159 to June 22, 1176.

<sup>98</sup> Created by Eugene III (1145-53), he signed from April 25, 1151 to March 27, 1181.

<sup>99</sup> PL 202, 233AB

<sup>1</sup> PL 202, 227-228. John X, Kamateros, Patriarch of Constantinople (1198-1206), is considered the author of two works written to refute Hugh's *De s. et imm. Deo*. See H. G. Beck, *Kirche u. theol. Lit.*, p. 662.

receiving it.<sup>2</sup> Through Prince Renauld de Châtillon he sent a Greek and a Latin edition of the work to the Latin Patriarch of Antioch, Aymeri of Limoges, who begins his reply with the flattery: *Pro eo quod scientiae vestrae splendor jam prope toti mundo serenus irradiavit...*<sup>3</sup> After more words of extraordinary praise and a request for three books, the Patriarch mentions that a silver cup was to accompany his reply: *Mittimus vobis cuppam unam argenteam in qua pro nostro amore pariter et honore volumus ut bibatis.*<sup>4</sup>

It is not known who wrote the abbreviated version of the *De sancto et immortalī Deo* which accompanies the treatise in a number of manuscripts under the title: *Compendiosa expositio in libro De Spiritu sancto magistri Ugonis.*<sup>5</sup>

Hugh's fame was bound to fill the citizens of Pisa with great pride.<sup>6</sup> Although Hugh was still a layman, the clergy of Pisa requested him to write on the state of the Christian souls after death. They pledged they would accept his judgement "with no less fervor than if it were St. Augustine's." Hugh obliged with his *Liber de anima corpore jam exuta sive de regressu animarum ab inferis, ad clerum Pisanum.*<sup>7</sup> It was written before 1171, the year in which a Pisan delegation returned from Constantinople after signing a peace treaty with Manuel.<sup>8</sup> The head of the delegation, Albert of Bolso, brought Hugh's book to the proud city of Pisa.<sup>9</sup>

While we do not know at what date Hugh wrote his *Adversus Patharenos*, still extant in two manuscripts,<sup>10</sup> we are in a position to fix the date of the completion of his *Liber de differentia naturae et personae*, for, in 1179, he gave a copy to Hugh of Honau who happened to be in Constantinople as a legate of Frederic Barbarossa<sup>11</sup>. On the same occasion Hugh of Honau received a copy of Hugh's *De (sancto et) immortalī Deo.*<sup>12</sup>

<sup>2</sup> PL 202, 227-230. Jaffé-Wattenbach, *Reg.*, n. 12957.

<sup>3</sup> PL 202, 229-230.

<sup>4</sup> PL 202, 232B.

<sup>5</sup> Dondaine, pp. 104-106. Dondaine shows that it must have originated in the East.

<sup>6</sup> The letter of the Pisan clergy begins (PL 202, 167): *Prudentiae tuae ac mirae scientiae fama veluti solis jubar universum prope orbem terrarum in dies magis magisque spargitur...*

<sup>7</sup> PL 202, 167A-226A.

<sup>8</sup> P. Lamma, *Comneni e Staufer 2* (Rome, 1957) 190. Burgundio of Pisa was a member of this delegation.

<sup>9</sup> PL 202, 167-8. Dondaine, pp. 106-8. A twelfth-century copy is preserved at the Cistercian Abbey of Zwettl (Austria): *MS* 237, fols. 87-130.

<sup>10</sup> A. Dondaine, pp. 109-114.

<sup>11</sup> Haskins, *Studies*, p. 210.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibidem.*

On September 24, 1180, the Emperor Manuel I Komnenos died. The carnage that followed in the spring of 1182 took the lives of more than 4,000 Latins, including the head of a Roman delegation, John, Cardinal of Holy Angel.<sup>13</sup> It is possible that Hugh left Constantinople before the notorious massacre, for Manuel's death also meant the end of his office as Imperial adviser.<sup>14</sup> However, there are reasons to assume that he stayed on until after the massacre in May, 1182. On Tuesday, September 1, 1181, Hugh's personal friend, Hubald, Cardinal-Bishop of Ostia, was elected pope under the name of Lucius III (1181-1185). On December 7, 1182, Pope Lucius wrote to Hugh's brother, Master Leo, "the Interpreter of Imperial Letters", in Constantinople, that his brother Hugh, Cardinal-Deacon of Holy Angel<sup>15</sup>, had passed away. So it seems more likely that both brothers had decided to stay in the East and that in the early summer of 1182 Hugh went to Rome to inform the Pope of the events and the tragic end of the Cardinal-Deacon of Holy Angel.

It was a noble gesture on the part of Pope Lucius to make Hugh the layman a deacon "in a shorter time than it had ever been done before" and to create him Cardinal-Deacon of Holy Angel. Pope Lucius recommends to Leo the carrier of the papal letter, Master Fabricius (nepotem tuum, de familia nostra), sent to the Emperor to investigate.

From March 13, 1182 to January 29, 1183 the papal Curia was in Velletri.<sup>16</sup> If we assume that Hugh left Constantinople after the massacre in May, 1182, he met the Pope at Velletri. He was ordained and promoted before July 14. The circumstances, the exact date and place of Hugh's death are a matter of conjecture. It seems that he died during a plague<sup>17</sup> at Velletri in August 1182.

#### THE MANUSCRIPT

The manuscript in which the dossier of three letters to Hugh Etherian and Hugh Etherian's *Liber de differentia* is found is preserved at the Municipal Library of Colmar, shelf number 188. The hand-

<sup>13</sup> He signed papal documents from Oct. 30, 1178 to July 28, 1181.

<sup>14</sup> Manuel's son and successor Alexis II Komnenos was 12 years old when his father died. In Nov., 1183, he was put to death by Manuel's cousin Andronikos.

<sup>15</sup> Jaffé-Wattenbach, *Reg.*, n. 14712. Dondaine (p. 95) has shown that Cardinal Hugh signed papal documents at Velletri on July, 14 (*Reg.*, n. 14681) and 15 (*Reg.*, n. 14682): Ego Hugo diaconus cardinalis s. Angeli subscripsi.

<sup>16</sup> Dondaine, p. 97.

<sup>17</sup> The chronicler Geoffrey, Prior of Vigewis, notes: Romae perinde mortalitas populum multum prostravit. Petrus legatus kalendis Augusti apud Ostiam, praesente Papa Lucio, decessit. MGH SS 26, 203, lines 43-44.

written catalogue describes this *codex* on p. 31 as "4° (150×220mm) — Marbach — Parchemin — Latin — 135 ff. xii<sup>e</sup> siècle. Reliure en bois recouvert de cuir. Plusieurs mains." The first work contained in it is *The Book on the Holy Spirit* by St. Didymus the Blind, translated by St. Jerome (fols. 1-33).

The dossier begins on fol. 33<sup>v</sup> (27 lines to a folio) and is arranged in such a way that the rubric of each letter is at the top of the folio. The dossier ends at the bottom of fol. 35<sup>v</sup> with the last three words written on an additional line to allow the rubric of the treatise to top the next folio: *Incipit liber Hugonis Aetheriani de differentia naturae et personae*. The capital K of the first word (*Karissimi*) is done in red and with an artistic touch while the capital of the word *Vestra* with which the treatise itself begins has never been executed. The script is rather mediocre, and errors are numerous. Some of these are easy to detect and to correct as, for instance, *nichi* for *nichil* or *diliencie* for *diligencie*. Some are due to a faulty analysis of abbreviations. Thus *uixit*, in the first chapter of the *Liber*, must have been *iux̄* for *iuxta*. Only the discovery of another manuscript will enable us to remove some or all of the other errors that are quite obvious but difficult to emend.

The *explicit* of the treatise is found on the fifth line of fol. 44<sup>r</sup>. It is followed by the entry on the seventh and eighth lines: *Liber domus sancti Augustini in Marpach Ordinis Canonicorum Regularium Basiliensis dyocesis*. The rest of the folio and folio 45-45<sup>r</sup> is blank.

The next part of the manuscript was joined to the first part at a later date. Its owner was marked on the first, now 46th, folio: *Liber domus sancti Augustini et Omnium sanctorum in Marpach Ordinis Canonicorum Regularium Basiliensis diocesis*.

Since Hugh Etherian's treatise reached the West in 1179 and both parts of our manuscript were written in the twelfth century, the monastery or abbey of Marbach<sup>18</sup> must have been the first and original owner. On fol. 46<sup>r</sup> a rubric announces: *Commentorum Boetii in Categoriis Aristotilis libri tres editionis prime*. Its *explicit* on fol. 135, line 8 (rest blank) marks the end of the *codex*. Many marginal notes testify to a frequent use of the *Boethian* commentary.<sup>19</sup>

It has been known for some time that the Canons Regular displayed a special interest in Gilbert's cause. This is here confirmed by the fact that the library of Marbach Abbey procured a copy of Hugh Etherian's

<sup>18</sup> In 1152, Egilulf, abbot of Marbach, witnessed a charter issued at Colmar by Frederick Barbarossa. *Gall. chr.* 5, 483 (instr.).

<sup>19</sup> See also the description given by A. Dondaine, p. 124, note 4, and p. 128.

compilation and the correspondence between one of their confrères, Hugh of Honau, and the famous Pisan in Constantinople.<sup>20</sup> The foundation of Marbach dates back to 1089. It adopted the rules and customs of Saint-Ruf.<sup>21</sup> Its first provost was Master Manegold of Lautenbach who brought in teachers from the Canons Regular of Lyons.<sup>22</sup> At Manegold's request, Pope Urban II approved its establishment on May 24, 1096.<sup>23</sup> Other papal charters followed.<sup>24</sup> The influence of this once famous abbey may also be judged by the numerous monasteries affiliated with it.<sup>25</sup>

## I

EPISTOLA<sup>1</sup>

## HUGONIS HONAUGIENSIS SCHOLASTICI

MISSA HUGONI AETHERIANO CONSTANTINOPOLIM<sup>2</sup>

1 Praecordiali amico et in Christo reverendo HUGONI<sup>3</sup> in arce theologiae sedenti HUGO<sup>4</sup> HONAUGIENSIS Scholasticus, Sacri Palatii Diaconus: Sincerae dilectionis et obsequii affectum.

2 Gloriosa nominis tui fama suavissimis odoribus non tam Illyricum quam Italiae Germaniaeque fines replens prolixo et periculoso itineris mei in Constantinopolim labores in tantum alleviavit ut desiderio videndi<sup>5</sup> et alloquendi tuam prudentiam nulla umquam vel maris vel terrae difficultas pervia mihi non fuisset. Certe non tam excellentissimi Romani Imperii legatus ad Orientalis Regni gubernatorem Constantinopolim adii quam tua praesentia et doctrinae dulcedine perfruenti insatiabili agitatus ardore veni libensque et laetus veni.

3 Quidni?<sup>6</sup> Nam et HIERONYMUS<sup>7</sup> GREGORIUM NANZANZENUM amore theologiae cuius inter Graecos sui temporis principatum tenebat, relicta Italia Asiaque

20 I suspect that the magnificent MS Basel, Univ. Lib. O II 24, which contains a fragment of Hugh's preface to *De diff.* (fol. 13) belonged to the Canons Regular of that district.

21 Cf. Ch. Dereine, 'Saint-Ruf et ses coutumes,' RBén 59 (1949) 180.

22 E. Herzog, *L'Abbaye de Marbach* (Colmar, 1928) 9.

23 PL 151, 455A.

24 See the papal decretals in PL 163, 116B (Aug. 2, 1103), 1130C (Oct. 30, 1119), PL 206, 911C (Jan. 20, 1192).

25 Cf. *Gall. chr.* 5, 884-5. J. M. Clauss, *Historisch-Topograph. Wörterbuch des Elsass* (Zabern, 1895) 636-7.

1 MS Colmar, Bibl. munic. 188, f. 33<sup>v</sup>. Dondaine, pp. 128-130 (doc. XIV). Date: 1173-1176.

2 Constantinopoli Dondaine.

3 ugoni MS.

4 ugo MS.

5 Dondaine, p. 129.

6 Quid mirum Dondaine.

7 Cf. *Ep.* 52, 8 (to Nepotianus); PL 22, 534 or CSEL 54, 429: Praeceptor quondam meus Gregorius Nazianzenus...



peragrata,<sup>8</sup> quaesivit in Graecia ac de fonte suarum disciplinarum et eruditionum saturari meruit. PYTHAGORAS<sup>9</sup> quoque *Memphiticos vates* in Aegypto, PLATO ARCHYTAM *Tarentinum* et TITUM LIVIUM *lacteo*,<sup>10</sup> ut HIERONYMUS<sup>11</sup> ait, *fonte eloquentiae manantem* aliqui amore videndi et audiendi virum eruditissimum Romae de longinquis orbis finibus adierunt. Petrum sane legimus Antiochiae manentem Paulum visitasse.

4 Nec ideo haec dixerim ut tantis viris comparari velim sed quia in desiderio videndi et audiendi sapientiae et artium titulis praecellentes valde cupio studiosis quibusque saltem imitando conformari. Quamobrem iniunctum a principe praedictae legationis onus<sup>12</sup> gratulanter subii non tam illius gloria inflatus quam tui cupidus aspectus et alloquii. Sed fortunae malignitas votis meis obstitit tuique copiam non minori mihi dolore abstulit quam si vitae huius summos honores dene-gasset.

5 Quod si ex culpa mea mihi accidit infortunium, merito quidem poenam [f. 34] sustineo. Ad indulgentiam tamen tuae serenitatis, virorum optime, de ignorantiae suffragiis aspiro. Exorata igitur tuam pietatem esse cupio ut culpam demonstres, si quae est, et amicum castiges. De cetero securus de tua benignitate obsecro ut postposita si qua<sup>13</sup> tibi indignatio tamen in me est ut non tam imperitiam meam quam totam latinitatem in his quaestionibus illumines quas tibi per magistrum RUDEGERUM, imperialis linguae in nostram et litterarum interpretem, scriptas Constantinopoli proposui atque per Graecorum doctorum auctoritates certifies.

6 Hae sunt autem quaestiones si memini: si natura et persona sunt idem; si deitas sit in persona et persona sit et subsistat ex deitatis natura ut ex causa et forma; si sicut hoc nomen "Deus" praedicatur de persona ita et hoc nomen "deitas"; si differentia est inter naturam et personales proprietates itemque inter<sup>14</sup> ipsas personas et earum idiomata;<sup>15</sup> quid proprie persona sit in divinis; quare, cum tam hypostasis quam usiae<sup>16</sup> interpretatio sit "substantia", tres dicantur hypostases<sup>17</sup> et una tantum usia quod videtur sonare tres substantiae et una substantia; item, quis quid assumpserit, utrum natura naturam vel persona personam, et quid cui unitum sit utrum natura personae vel natura naturae; si dici possit quod natura<sup>18</sup> trium personarum communis, scilicet deitatis usia, sit incarnata; item, quid sit simplicem esse Deum utrum ex eo quod diversas non habeat naturas quibus sit dicatur "simplex" vel ex eo quod ipse Deus Trinitas et forma, qua est Deus, sit idem et nulla sit inter naturam et rem naturae i.e. personam differentia; item, quibus Graecorum doctorum auctoritatibus Spiritus sanctus a Filio etiam<sup>19</sup> procedere probari possit.

<sup>8</sup> pera[r] grata *Dondaine*.

<sup>9</sup> Jerome, *Ep.* 53, 1 (to Paulinus); PL 22, 540 or CSEL 54, 443: Sic Phythagoras Memphiticos vates, sic Plato Aegyptum et Architam Tarentinum eamque oram Italiae quae quondam Magna Graecia dicebatur laboriosissime peragravit.

<sup>10</sup> Lacte(o) *Dondaine*.

<sup>11</sup> *Ep.* 53, 1; PL 22, 541: Ad T. Livium lacteo eloquentiae fonte manantem.

<sup>12</sup> honus MS.

<sup>13</sup> que *Dondaine*.

<sup>14</sup> circa *Dondaine*.

<sup>15</sup> ydiomata MS.

<sup>16</sup> ypostasis quam ysie MS.

<sup>17</sup> ypostases MS.

<sup>18</sup> *Dondaine*, p. 130.

<sup>19</sup> esse (vel) *Dondaine*.

7 Haec enim omnia<sup>20</sup> Latinorum habent auctorum certa et evidentia documenta. Sed quia a Graecis sapientiae totius fons emanavit teque Deus non tam Latinae quam Graecae eloquentiae titulis florentissimum his temporibus exhibuit, rogo ut has Latinorum periculosas dubitationes, etiam in Sabellianum dogma personam et naturam confundens<sup>21</sup> deducentes, Graecorum doctorum auctoritatibus, qui de his expressius quam nostri locuti sunt, amputes et huic liti sententiis illorum finem imponas.

Salutat te magister PETRUS in his mecum existens dubitationibus intimus tuus amicus.

## II

EPISTOLA<sup>1</sup>

## HUGONIS HONAUGIENSIS SCHOLASTICI

MISSA HUGONI AETHERIANO CONSTANTINOPOLIM<sup>2</sup>

1 Praecordiali amico et in Christo reverendo HUGONI,<sup>3</sup> inclyto tam inter Graecos quam inter Latinos theologo, HUGO<sup>4</sup> ille, sibi utinam sicut in vocabulo ita par in utroque eloquio, Sacri Palatii Diaconus: Cum BASILIO et THEOLOGO ceterisque Graeciae theologis veram intueri philosophiam.

2 Indignationem quam in me habuisti, cum praesens eram Constantinopoli, non percepi. Per magistrum RUDEGERUM in ipso suae recessionis articulo cognovi. Dederam quidem ei litteras, *apologon* ignorantiae meae continentes, tuae Celsitudinis<sup>5</sup> ferendas. Sed si illa causa fuit unde succenseres quam mihi innotuit, sciat admirabilis et singularis Prudentia tua quia non ex meo sed ex scriptoris vitio accidit ut nomen tuum meo subsecundaret.

3 Licet tamen dissimulaveris ut vir discretus,<sup>6</sup> scio ideo me tuam non meruisse praesentiam quia, si non dixeris, intellexeris me tamen in eo schismate<sup>7</sup> apparuisse quod Germania tota fovisse videbatur Papam ALEXANDRUM repudians in quo religionis tuae sanctitas contaminari per meam comunione noluit.

4 Quia tamen fidei catholicae unitas per intemperatum sensum et credulitatem sinceram me tibi coniungit licet tu altiori intelligentia<sup>8</sup> vertice sidera pulses,<sup>9</sup> utpote

<sup>20</sup> The reading is uncertain. Dondaine reads: Hec conclusiones. But since, shortly afterwards, Hugh refers to *has Latinorum periculosas dubitationes*, he can hardly have written *conclusiones*.

<sup>21</sup> confundentes MS and Dondaine.

<sup>1</sup> MS Colmar, Bibl. munic. 188, fol. 34<sup>v</sup>. Date: 1177-1178.

<sup>2</sup> Constantinopoli Dondaine.

<sup>3</sup> MS has only the letter u.

<sup>4</sup> MS has only the letter n (not h).

<sup>5</sup> The original *celsitudinis* has been corrected by a dot underneath the final s.

<sup>6</sup> discretus MS.

<sup>7</sup> The schism lasted from the beginning of Alexander III's reign (1159) to the Peace of Venice in the summer of 1177.

<sup>8</sup> The MS reads: licet tu (in?) altiori intelliencia vertice sidera pulses. Dondaine suggests the correction: licet tu altioris intelligencie vertice sidera pulses. Perhaps Hugh wrote: licet in altioris intelligentiae vertice sidera pulses.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. Vergil, *Aen.* 3, 619: Ipse arduus altaque pulsat sidera.

scripturis sanctorum Graeciae doctorum BASILII, THEOLOGI, CYRILLI aliorumque quasi pennis quibusdam sublevatus<sup>10</sup> in sublime volitans, deprecor tuam bonitatem ut in his quaestionibus, quas per RUDEGERUM<sup>11</sup> praefatum et Constantino-  
poli tibi porrexisti et postea per eundem a Germania in memoriam reduxi, de Graecorum opulentia penuriam non tam meam quam omnium Latinorum adiuves.

5 Lator praesentium BARTHOLOMAEUS schedulas tuas mihi reportabit et magistro PETRO qui mecum laboravit fideliter in eisdem dubitationibus tui<sup>12</sup> nominis diligentissimus propagator. Hic primo tuam notitiam cordi meo infixit. Itaque aeternae memoriae cum summis praeconiis noveris nomen tuum mandari si quod ego et ille amicus tuus petimus impleveris et promissum tuum effectui mancipaveris.

## III

EPISTOLA<sup>1</sup>

PETRI SCHOLASTICI WIENNENSIS

MISSA DE AUSTRIA HUGONI AETHERIANO CONSTANTINOPOLIM<sup>2</sup>

1 Dilectissimo domino et amico suo HUGONI,<sup>3</sup> venerabili theologo, eius devotissimus PETRUS, omnium fidelium ultimus: Dilectionis atque obsequii perseverantiam.

2 Quod scripta illius sinceritatis, quam erga vos habeo, vestrae non communicavi a longo tempore discretioni, negligentiae minime ascribendum est sed necessitati. Aestimo etenim idoneum non esse per legatos non idoneos scribere de rebus tam idoneis. Porro quia ordinatio divina latorem praesentium, vestrum ac meum amicum, videlicet magistrum HUGONEM,<sup>4</sup> mihi ultro obtulit qui et ipse earum rerum super quibus vobis scripturus sum diligentissimus indagator est, per eundem humilitatis meae scripta praesentia vestrae dirigo magnitudini, quibus quidem a vestra requiro dilectione discretissima auctoritates Graecorum theologorum quae evidenter significant inter naturam et personam dividendum esse.

3 Facile etenim est in rebus naturalibus inter naturam rei et rem naturae diversitatis investigare causas naturales eo quod in eis forma habet materiam quam informat, ut aliquid sit, et distinguit accidentibus, ut talis vel quanta sit, et per partes termino<sup>5</sup> definitionis comprehendit.

4 Verumtamen in rebus supernaturalibus, quia *forma est sine materia*<sup>6</sup> nec accidentibus subiecta neque ex partibus compacta, tam difficile est quanto constat incomprehensibilem esse universam quam definitionis vel divisionis vel syllogismi

<sup>10</sup> Dondaine, p. 131.

<sup>11</sup> Ruderegerum *MS and Dondaine*.

<sup>12</sup> (et) tui *Dondaine*.

<sup>1</sup> *MS* Colmar, Bibl. munic. 188, fols. 35-35<sup>v</sup>. Date: about 1171.

<sup>2</sup> Constantinopoli *Dondaine*.

<sup>3</sup> ugoni *MS*.

<sup>4</sup> ugonem *MS*.

<sup>5</sup> terminatio *Dondaine*.

<sup>6</sup> Boethius, *De Trin.*, 2; ed. Stewart-Rand, p. 10, line 30: Sed divina substantia sine materia forma est.

ratio non attingit. Si enim divinitas in Deo est tamquam natura rei in re naturae, videtur consequi ut deitas<sup>7</sup> naturae rei sit et Deus res naturae. Qui ergo Deus est, res huius naturae est. Pater vero et Filius et Spiritus eorum<sup>8</sup> Deus est. Ergo Pater et Filius et Spiritus sanctus res naturae est.

5 Cum ergo loquimur de Deo i.e. vel de Patre vel de Filio vel de Spiritu sancto, de re naturae loquimur. Cum ergo dicimus "Deus est deitas"<sup>9</sup> vel "Deitas<sup>10</sup> est Deus", de re [f. 35v] naturae loquimur. Nihil enim est Deus quod non sit res naturae i.e. Pater et Filius et Spiritus sanctus. Quamvis ergo res naturae vere nominetur Deus, natura vero rei vere deitas nominetur, utrumque tamen nomen, deitas scilicet et Deus,<sup>11</sup> rei naturae per praedicationem assignatur.

6 Qui enim Deus est, vere dicitur "Deus" ad instar naturalium; et vere dicitur "deitas" ultra naturalium infirmitatem. Cetera enim non sunt id quod sunt.<sup>12</sup> Deus autem Deus est et deitas. Unde accidit ut nomine naturae<sup>13</sup> aliquando naturam rei, aliquando rem naturae nominamus. Cum enim dicimus "Deitas in eo est", naturam rei suo nomine nominamus. Cum vero dicimus "Deitas Deus est", rem naturae, non naturam rei, nomine nominamus. Nihil enim Deus est nisi res naturae. Quod si res naturae est Trinitas personarum, natura vero rei est unitas essentiae, merito ratio dividit<sup>14</sup> inter causam unitatis et causam pluralitatis.

7 Deus enim, qui vere unus est, unus est et trinus. Non ex eodem unus est et trinus sed proprietatibus alterificis<sup>15</sup> est trinus et essentiâ individuâ est unus. Secundum quod est in personis proprietas et in essentia unitas.<sup>16</sup>

8 Cum igitur in his expressius locuti sint Graecorum quam Latinorum theologi, dilectionem vestram attentius imploro ut eorum<sup>17</sup> auctoritates mihi transmittere dignemini per quas evidentius quam nostri significant inter naturam et personam ratione dividendum esse.<sup>18</sup>

9 Obsecro etiam discretionem vestram ut in magistro HUGONE illam venerari curetis familiaritatem quam Dominus Imperator Romanorum piissimus FRIDERICUS circa eius fidem ac discretionem habet. Meam quoque devotissimam dilectionem quam ad ipsum habeo penset ea, quae inter me et vos est, dilectio immuta-

<sup>7</sup> divinitas *Dondaine*.

<sup>8</sup> *Dondaine*, p. 132.

<sup>9</sup> divinitas *Dondaine*.

<sup>10</sup> divinitas *Dondaine*.

<sup>11</sup> Dei MS.

<sup>12</sup> Boethius, *De Trin.*, 2; ed. Stewart-Rand, p. 10, line 31: Reliqua enim non sunt id quod sunt.

<sup>13</sup> Gilbert, *Contra Eutychen* 5, 55; ed. Haring, p. 313, distinguishes between a *nomen naturae* (for instance, *divinitas*, *humanitas*) and a *nomen personae* (for instance, *Deus*, *homo*).

<sup>14</sup> Cf. Otto of Freising, *Gesta Frid.* I, 58; MGH SS 20, 384, line 32: De primo (capitulo) tantum Romanus Pontifex diffinivit, ne aliqua ratio in theologia inter naturam et personam divideret. The first capitulum read (I, 50; p. 379, line 25): Quod videlicet assereret divinam essentiam non esse Deum.

<sup>15</sup> alteraficis *Dondaine*. The term is derived from Sophronius, *Ep. synodica*; PG 87 (III), 3159A: propter alterificas... proprietates.

<sup>16</sup> Praefatio ss. Trinitatis.

<sup>17</sup> earum MS and *Dondaine*.

<sup>18</sup> See note 14.

bilis ut in scriptum, quo<sup>19</sup> apud vos suam dirigit investigationem, diligentiae<sup>20</sup> suae quae<sup>21</sup> in Spiritu sancto est satisfacere studeatis.

10 Denique cum apud sapientes sedet<sup>22</sup> auctoritas consilii per eam potestatem rationis, quae maior in eis consistit, intendite cum per vos tum per<sup>23</sup> magistrum LEONEM negotio unitatis finaliter promovendo quod inter duos Imperatores saluberrime tractatur.

## IV

INCIPIT<sup>1</sup> LIBER  
HUGONIS AETHERIANI  
DE DIFFERENTIA NATURAE ET PERSONAE

1 Karissimis amicis HUGONI<sup>2</sup> atque PETRO, theologiae optimis<sup>3</sup> interpretibus, HUGO AETHERIANUS:<sup>4</sup> cum Nazareis illum animo complecti qui solus est absque mutatione.

Serra, ut nostis, virorum peritissimi,<sup>5</sup> durae ut sit materiae indiget. Nemo enim serram dicit quae<sup>6</sup> in cera formam nacta est. Et mihi quidem tonsilla<sup>7</sup> non cerea<sup>8</sup> sed ferrea opus est si, iuxta<sup>9</sup> pignus amicitiae vestrae, quo servo,<sup>10</sup> iactatam fluctibus ratem portu velim sistere. Opus est creta et carbonibus<sup>11</sup> et ratione praemeditata quae non ab incredibili, a<sup>12</sup> sanctorum vero Patrum auctoritate incipiat.

2 Praecursio nempe iuvaminis extrinsecus indigens ad se non trahit consequens principaliter. Causa utique praecursoria vim non habet efficiendi et, remota exis-

<sup>19</sup> ut in scriptumque apud ... MS. ut in scriptum que apud ... *Dondaine*.

<sup>20</sup> diligencie MS.

<sup>21</sup> qua *Dondaine*.

<sup>22</sup> sed MS.

<sup>23</sup> supplēvi per (*Dondaine*).

1 MS Colmar, Bibl. munic. 188, fol. 36. A. *Dondaine* (Docum. XVII), pp. 133 f. The first few lines of this introduction are found (without title) in MS Basel, Univ. Lib. O II 24, fol. 13: (C)arissimis amicis hugoni atque petro theologie optimis interpretibus ugo eterianus: Cum Nazareis illum animo complecti qui solus est absque mutatione. Serra, ut nostis ... iactatam fluctibus. The rest of the folio is empty.

2 ugoni MS.

3 optimis MS.

4 ugo eterianus MS. The spelling in the title is: hugonis etheriani.

5 periritissimi MS.

6 quod *Dondaine*.

7 Isidore, *Etym.* XIX, ii, 14 (ed. Lindsay), states: Tonsilla uncinus ferreus vel ligneus ad quem in litore defixum funes navium inligantur.

8 cerea[s] *Dondaine*.

9 vixit MS vi(n)xit *Dondaine*. MS Basel: iuxta.

10 (si) add. *Dondaine*.

11 Horace, *Sat.* II, 3, 246: Sanin creta an carbone notati? Persius, *Sat.* V, 108: IIIa prius creta, mox haec carbone notasti?

12 ab MS.

tens ab archanis theologiae, stabilitos transgredientem terminos mittit<sup>13</sup> in profluentem. Scriptum quippe est: *Bestia si tetigerit montem, lapidibus obruetur*.<sup>14</sup>

3 Verum de disparibus haereticorum calamis fieri potest interdum excerptio. De sanctorum vero Patrum sententiis pie nemo censetur eligere. Nodus quidem ventilatae ambiguitatis solam illam exigit causam quae ratas faciat conclusiones. Caeterum sine materia, loco et tempore nihil<sup>15</sup> potest ex aliquo fieri. Atqui licet locus, instrumentum et tempus pareant, materia tamen ambiguo proposito vix obsequitur pro voluntate utriusque partis. Cuius profecto ad motionem nervi me deficiunt. Et materia ipsa, quae vim efficiendi possidet, superat.<sup>16</sup> Longe vis est a me<sup>17</sup> quae ascendentis<sup>18</sup> existit necessaria et accensum movet atque permutat. Nulla chorda desideratu<sup>19</sup> sonum reddit modulanti et idcirco symphonia confunditur cantusque [f. 36v] modulatio.

4 Praeterea his suppetentibus difficillimum est transferendo vel componendo de trium Personarum earundemque naturae differentia enodare aliquid secundum rubricam disciplinarum. Facillimum enim est et absque quotidianis lugubrationibus condita<sup>20</sup> reprehensum iri. Verbi sane calumniatores affectu non iudicio editiones rodunt huiusmodi. Certo voto proni ad infamandum et mordaci redundantes aceto et praegrandi afflatu gorgoneo inficiunt sanguine aggredientem investigare viam veritatis.

5 Quippe animal pennatum et quadrupes minutis orbiculis super pictum equitant et viribus<sup>21</sup> et celeritate mordendi *basiliscum* heremi vastae calliditatis vincunt qui, ut SOLINUS<sup>22</sup> refert, quas *polluit herbas exstinguit, necat arbores* et aera *corrumpit* sed *mustelis tamen vincitur*. Itaque non nos sed illos scalpant qui ad dilucidanda fandorum dubia septemtrionis sideribus polo proximis similes sunt. Breves enim in erratibus<sup>23</sup> suis gyros peragunt et numquam occidunt. Sed, ut IOB<sup>24</sup> dicit, *sapientia trahitur de occultis et abscondita est ab oculis omnium viventium*.

6 Quamdiu enim hic vivitur, unius deitatis ad tres personas differentia, cum creaturam omnem forma Dei penitus lateat, perfecte cognosci non potest. Vos tamen, quos splendor<sup>25</sup> illustrat aethereus et a multis solibus *cyllenia* compsit *proles*,<sup>26</sup>

<sup>13</sup> The reading is uncertain: *mittitur* or *inittitur*? Dondaine reads *mutat*.

<sup>14</sup> This may be Hugh's own translation of *Hb* 12:20: Et si bestia tetigerit montem, lapidabitur.

<sup>15</sup> *nichi* MS.

<sup>16</sup> *subaudi* me (*superat*).

<sup>17</sup> *longe ignis est a me* MS.

<sup>18</sup> *qui ascendendi* MS.

<sup>19</sup> *desideratu(m)* Dondaine. Cf. Horace, *Ars poetica* 348: nam neque chorda sonum reddit quem vult manus et mens.

<sup>20</sup> *enodita* Dondaine.

<sup>21</sup> *virus* MS and Dondaine.

<sup>22</sup> J. S. Solinus, *Coll. rer. mem.* 27, 51; ed. Th. Mommsen (Berlin, 1958) 126: ... *extinguit herbas, nectat arbores, ipsas etiam corrumpit auras*... (27, 53; p. 127): *mustelis tamen vincitur*...

<sup>23</sup> *narratibus* MS and Dondaine.

<sup>24</sup> *Job* 28:18.

<sup>25</sup> *spendor* MS.

<sup>26</sup> Vergil, *Aen.* IV, 258.

me secus Ponticas<sup>27</sup> fauces Byzantii<sup>28</sup> situm apud quem aer spissatur in nubes distillantem ex Patrum aere favum referto philosophia pectoris vestri promptuario exponere coegistis. Quapropter hortatu benevolentiae<sup>29</sup> vestrae quam, ne iniurius [f. 37] videar, praeterire nequeo, non in luxum sed in cenaculum<sup>30</sup> ad formidolosum deproperavi bidental. Excussi quoque inter personam naturamque dividendi rationem ex Graecorum copiis, ut illam sumptam habeat transmittatque in aures publicas, si dignum videatur animi vestri docta sententia.

\* \* \*

7 Vestra propositio, qua secundum artium *methodon* a natura differre ostenditis personas, satis probabilitatis habet. Nam deitas incognita et incomprehensibilis natura est. Et eiusmodi naturae ab orthodoxis<sup>31</sup> tres personae esse censentur. Quae quidem personae coniunctim vere dicuntur una deitas unaque natura. Et ideo, ut plerique asserunt, quod per omnia ea quae in Patre deitas ea in Filio eaque in sancto Spiritu sine ullo termino<sup>32</sup> sineque ulla penitus existit mutatione. Verumtamen tres personas "rem naturae" sive deitatem "naturam rei" Graecia, formidando prioris cum posteriori intelligentiam<sup>33</sup> naturalium consecutionem, pronuntiare fugitat. Cumque dicitur Deus "deitas" seu deitas "Deus", ad naturam tantum dicti referunt conceptionem.<sup>34</sup> Quando autem ab eis quaeritur talium locutionum sensus: Pater naturâ Deus est et secundum deitatem quam habet Deus est Pater, trinam reddunt responsionem: non positione, substantialiter et vere.

8 Naturae autem huiusmodi supponit descriptionem vir magnae sanctitatis ANASTASIUS: Natura est vera rei existentia. Omne namque quod verum esse praestat<sup>35</sup> dicitur natura; nequaquam vero quod per<sup>36</sup> phantasiam intelligitur. Et notandum, inquit,<sup>37</sup> quod natura et substantia idem apud ecclesiae doctores significant. Et rursus: Natura dicitur quod pluribus secundum substantiam est commune.<sup>38</sup> Ea quidem in personas<sup>39</sup> deducitur sed personae in naturam non dividun-

<sup>27</sup> poticas MS.

<sup>28</sup> bytantii MS.

<sup>29</sup> benivolencę MS.

<sup>30</sup> gentaculum MS. tentaculum *proposed by Dondaine*.

<sup>31</sup> archodoxis MS.

<sup>32</sup> terino MS.

<sup>33</sup> intellenciam MS. Hugh may have written: formidando prioris cum posteriori secundum intelligentiam naturalium consecutionem.

<sup>34</sup> See, for instance, St. Gregory of Nyssa, *De comm. notionibus*; PG 45, 178BC.

<sup>35</sup> praesta MS.

<sup>36</sup> *supplevi* per (ex Hugone Honaugiensi).

<sup>37</sup> inquit MS.

<sup>38</sup> *Viae Dux*, 2; PG 89, 59A. Hugh of Honau, *Liber de diversitate naturae et personae* XIX, 2; MS Cambridge, Univ. Lib. II. 4. 27, fol. 145: Hinc Anastasius, vir magnae sanctitatis apud Graecos, naturam describens ait: Natura est vera rei existentia. Omne namque quod verum esse praestat dicitur natura; nequaquam vero quod per phantasiam intelligitur. Et notandum quod natura, forma et substantia idem apud ecclesiae doctores significant. Et rursus: Natura dicitur quod pluribus secundum substantiam est commune.

<sup>39</sup> personas *corr.* ex personis.

tur. Ex quo utique ac ex quibusdam sacrae Scripturae locis evidens esse affirmat naturam personamque non esse idem.

9 Initium<sup>40</sup> autem assumit a Moysse in hunc modum: *Dixit Dominus Deus: Germinet terra her [f. 37<sup>v</sup>] bam virentem et facientem semen iuxta genus suum.*<sup>41</sup> Et illud: *Producant aquae reptilia animarum viventium secundum genus suum.*<sup>42</sup> Differentia "genera" naturas vocavit, non personas, hoc docente Deo quod alia quidem est natura aquatiliū, alia autem reptiliū, alia vero ferarum et alia hominum.

10 Iacobus autem Apostolus "naturas" dicit quas Moyses vocavit "genera". *Omnis, inquit, natura bestiarum et volucrum et caeterorum domantur et domita sunt a natura.*<sup>43</sup> Non dixit: a persona hominis; non enim humanitas una persona est sed infinitae personae una natura i.e. natura<sup>44</sup> hominis.<sup>45</sup> Deinde Pauli subiungit testimonium dicentis: *Gentes quae legem non habent natura quae legis sunt faciunt*<sup>46</sup> hoc est in veritate *Ad Corinthios* quoque ait: *Decet mulierem non velatam orare Deum? nec ipsa natura docet vos*<sup>47</sup> i.e. ipsa rei existentia.

11 Et idem rursus vir: *Maledixit Deus Cain.*<sup>48</sup> Numquid omnem hominum naturam maledixit? Minime, sed unam tantum personam quae ei peccaverat. Similiter Noc filii personam maledixit, non naturam dicens: *Maledictus sit Cham. Servus erit fratrū suorum.*<sup>49</sup> Iacob etiam dicit: *Vidi Dominum facie ad faciem et salva facta est anima mea.*<sup>50</sup> Numquid dicere poterat Iacob: Vidi naturam Dei? David quoque ait: *Illustra faciem tuam.*<sup>51</sup> Non enim *illustra* dicere poterat naturam tuam. Similia in Evangelio Christus: *Videte ne contemnetis unum ex pusillis istis. Dico vobis quia angeli eorum vident faciem Patris mei qui in caelis est.* Nam quod naturam nullius viderit *Unigenitus Filius qui est in sinu Patris ipse enarravit.*<sup>52</sup> Ergo non est idem natura et persona.

12 GREGORIUS<sup>53</sup> vero NYSSAE similium assertor est. Ait enim in quodam sermone: Unum hominem universam naturam cognoscimus iuxta illud: *Homo sicut faenum dies eius.*<sup>54</sup> Singulariter quod naturae commune est pronuntiavit. Nam quod omnibus convenit, de omnibus enuntiative dixit eo quod unus cognoscitur omnis homo et non plures.

13 Magnus quoque CYRILLUS<sup>55</sup> in quodam *ad Hermiam* [f. 38] sermone sic loquitur: Multa inter naturam et personam currit differentia. Ecce infinitae quidem

40 *Viae Dux*, 8; PL 89, 122B. Anastasius (PG 89, 58AB) cites *Wisdom* 13:1 and *Eph.* 2:3.

41 *Gen.* 1:11.

42 *Gen.* 1:20.

43 *Jas.* 3:7. *Supple:* humana. *Viae Dux*, 8; PG 89, 122D.

44 naturae MS.

45 hunius MS.

46 faciunt MS. *Rom.* 2:4: Gentes quae legem non habent, naturaliter ea quae legis sunt faciunt. *Viae Dux*, 8; PG 89, 126A.

47 *1 Cor.* 11:13 f.

48 Caim MS. Cf. *Gen.* 4:11. *Viae Dux*, 8; PG 89, 127B.

49 *Gen.* 9:25: Maledictus Chanaan, servus servorum erit. *Viae Dux*, 8; PG 89, 127C.

50 *Gen.* 32:30. *Viae Dux*, 8; PG 89, 127D.

51 *Ps.* 30:17.

52 *Mt.* 18:10 and *John* 1:18. *Viae Dux*, 8; PG 89, 131A.

53 Gregory of Nyssa, *De comm. notionibus*; PG 45, 182A.

54 *Ps.* 102, 15. End of quotation.

55 Anastasius, *Viae Dux*, 9 and 8; PG 89, 143A and 126A. Cf. *De ss. Trin. dial.* I; PG 75, 699A.



personae sumus hic, natura vero una universi. Quare si naturae personae essent, importune deposuisset Sabellium sancta Nicaena Synodus unam personam dicentem in una substantia sanctae Trinitatis. Item, si natura persona esset et persona natura, quomodo, inquit, anathemate percussus fuisset ARIUS tres in tribus personis confitens naturas eiusdem deitatis: qui utique nequit<sup>56</sup> in sancta Trinitate confiteri personas, ne forte tres inveniantur naturae; neque rursus duas in Christo naturas, ne cogatur duas confiteri personas in eo ut NESTORIUS.

14 NYSSAENSIVM VERO GREGORIUS<sup>57</sup> rursus *Ad Aulalium* talia scribit: Quemadmodum in Adam et in Abel humanitas una sic in Patre atque Filio deitas una. Et iterum: Una increata natura in Patre et Filio sanctoque Spiritu intelligitur cui, quod proprium est, hoc est commune personis. Nam deitas, quod est commune personis, significat; persona<sup>58</sup> vero<sup>59</sup> quod est proprium.<sup>60</sup> Amplius: Nos quidem infinitam et incomprehensibilem divinam naturam esse credentes nullam ipsius intelligimus comprehensionem sed per omnem modum interminabilem debere intelligi constituimus. Etenim quod universaliter infinitum est, non in parte quidem terminatur, in parte vero minime, sed omni modo terminum fugit infinitas. Haec autem natura communis est tribus personis quarum unaquaeque Deus. At<sup>61</sup> non secundum alteritatem quam habet Pater ad Filium secundum hoc Deus Pater sic ut<sup>62</sup> non sit Deus Filius. Nam si quia, inquit, Pater est Pater ideo et Deus est Pater et quia non est Pater Filius neque Deus. Si autem Deus Filius non quia Filius; similiter et Pater non quia Pater Deus sed quia substantia huiusmodi qua est Pater et Filius et per quam Pater Deus et Filius Deus et sanctus Spiritus Deus, non divisa substantia per personas ut tres sint substantiae secundum personas sed neque nomen dividendum quod substantiam significat, [f. 38v] hoc est 'Deus', ut sint tres dii. Nam sicut substantia Pater, substantia Filius, substantia Spiritus sanctus, et non tres substantiae, ita et Deus Pater, Deus Filius, Deus Spiritus sanctus, et non tres dii. Etenim<sup>63</sup> neque Petrum neque Paulum et Barnabam dicimus proprie tres substantias. Una enim et eadem talium personarum substantia persona Petri substantia est, persona Pauli substantia est, et sunt duae personae sed non duae humanitates.

15 Amplius inter naturam et personam quidem philosophus huiusmodi assignat differentias. Divina, inquit, natura trium personarum forma est. At<sup>64</sup> nulla personarum personae alicuius<sup>65</sup> forma. Hypostasis naturam habet. Natura vero naturam non habet. Natura est vera personarum existentia; hypostasis autem nequaquam cum unaquaeque suas proprietatis singulariter habeat. Natura continet personas. Non autem continet persona personas. Sane Dei Verbum in eo quod per se existit dividitur ab eo a quo personam habet sed quia in se habet, quae circa Deum inspicuntur, idem est illi secundum naturam. Et notandum, inquit, quattuor esse: unitatem scilicet, naturam, formam et monarchiam quae de nulla personarum rite

<sup>56</sup> nequid MS.

<sup>57</sup> Gregory of Nyssa, *De fide ad Simplicium*; PG 45, 142B or ed. F. Mueller (Leiden, 1958) 20.

<sup>58</sup> personam MS.

<sup>59</sup> *supple*: significat.

<sup>60</sup> Cf. *De comm. notionibus*; PG 45, 182A: Basil, *Ep.* 38, 3; PG 32, 327D.

<sup>61</sup> *De comm. not.*; PG 45, 175C-178A.

<sup>62</sup> enim MS.

<sup>63</sup> PG 45, 178B.

<sup>64</sup> ad MS.

<sup>65</sup> *supple*: est.

dici queunt, de ipsa vero deitate convenienter enuntiantur.<sup>66</sup> Nam in *forma Dei* esse tantumdem est quantum in substantia Dei esse. Porro sicut ex *forma servi* assumptione nobis dicitur consubstantialis Dominus noster Iesus Christus ita ex *forma Dei* esse consubstantialis dicitur Patri. Quare manifestum non esse idem personam et naturam.

16 Magnus vero BASILIUS<sup>67</sup> de personae ac naturae differentia in quadam *ad Terentium epistola* huiusmodi scribit: Oportet sub compendio, quod nobis videtur, exprimere. Dicimus itaque quam habet rationem commune ad singulare, hanc habet ad personam substantia. Nam<sup>68</sup> quisque nostrum et communi substantiae ratione,<sup>69</sup> esse scilicet, participat et eis quas circa se habet proprietatibus ita ibi substantiae quidem ratio communis est veluti bonitas, deitas et si quid aliud intelligatur, hypostasis<sup>70</sup> vero per idioma paternitatis seu filiationis sive sanctificativae virtutis discernitur. Si [f. 39] ergo non existere dicunt personas ex hoc ipso habet ratio inconveniens. Quod si vere fatentur existere, quod confitentur, enumerent ut substantialis ratio in unitate naturae appareat et pia cognitio Patris et Filii sanctique Spiritus perfecte ac pleniter praedicetur.

17 *Ad Amphiloichium*<sup>71</sup> rursus consona his in quadam epistola conecit: Substantia et hypostasis hanc habent differentiam quam commune habet ad singulare ut animal ad quemlibet hominem.

Ideo<sup>72</sup> substantiam quidem in deitate unam confitemur ut illius, quod est esse, ratio indifferenter assignetur, personam vero proprietatibus unicam,<sup>73</sup> ut inconfusa permaneat et ampliata quae de Patre et Filio ac Spiritu sancto intelligentia existit Nobis<sup>74</sup> utique non intelligentibus aphorismos<sup>75</sup> seu circa singula<sup>76</sup> characteres, dico autem paternitatem, filiationem et sanctificationem, sed ex communi conceptione illius quod est esse Deum confitentibus innachinabile<sup>77</sup> prorsus fidei rationem as-

<sup>66</sup> Cf. *Contra Eunomium* IV; PG 45, 671A.

<sup>67</sup> *Ep.* 214, 4; PG 32, 790B.

<sup>68</sup> *supple*: sicut.

<sup>69</sup> rationem MS.

<sup>70</sup> Hugh of Honau, *Lib. de diversitate* XV, 7; fol. 141<sup>v</sup>: Alibi Basilius in *Epistola ad Terentium* breviter ostendit per nomina earum quibus proprietatibus quaelibet personarum cognoscatur esse persona dicens: Persona secundum proprietatem paternitatis seu filiationis aut sanctificativae virtutis conspicitur. See also XVII, 2; fol. 142<sup>v</sup>: In quo concordat cum Basilio qui de persona dicit: Persona secundum proprietatem paternitatis vel filiationis vel sanctificativae virtutis conspicitur.

<sup>71</sup> *Ep.* 236, 6; PG 32, 883A.

<sup>72</sup> *idei* MS.

<sup>73</sup> The reading is not quite certain since the first letter is blotted out.

<sup>74</sup> See the *Dialogus Ratii et Everardi*; ed. N. Haring, MSt 15 (1953) 259: Hoc idem probat magnus Basilius in libro quem scripsit de Trinitate sic: Nobis ignorantibus circa singularia characteres — dico autem paternitatem, filiationem, sanctificationem — oportet communi proprium addicere et fidem confiteri. Commune est deitas; proprium est paternitas. Quibus copulatis necesse est personam confici quae est Deus Pater. Unde dicitur 'Credo in Deum Patrem'. See also Everard's letter to Pope Urban III; ed. N. Haring, MSt 17 (1955) 163.

<sup>75</sup> *aforismus* MS. St. Basil uses the verbal form *aphōrisménous . . . charaktéras*.

<sup>76</sup> *singulam* MS. Hugh of Honau had this sentence in mind when he wrote of St. Basil (*De divers.* XVIII, 5; fol. 143): Rursumque in *Epistola ad Amphiloichium* de proprietatibus personarum loquens "breves annotationes" seu "circa singula characteres" eas vocans, personas appellat "singularia" et "singula".

<sup>77</sup> The Greek *améchanon* means that it is impossible to . . .

signari. Oportet igitur communi proprium adicere hoc quoque modo fidem confiteri: commune deitas, proprium paternitas, quibus copulatis necesse est dicere *Credo in Deum Patrem*. Idem fieri exigit Filii sanctique Spiritus confessio ut dicere possimus: *Credo in Deum Filium et in Deum Spiritum sanctum*, ut per totum unitas in Trinitatis<sup>78</sup> servetur confessione.

18 *Idem Adversus Eunomium*:<sup>79</sup> Filius in Patre et Pater in Filio eo quod iste qualis et ille et ille. Quare secundum personarum proprietatem unus et unus, secundum vero naturae communitatem ambo unum. Idem<sup>80</sup> sic hypostasim describit: Hypostasis est substantia cum proprietatibus vel concursus circa singularia proprietatum. Nam<sup>81</sup> collectio singularium proprietatum communi substantiae adveniens hoc aliquid significat. Proprietates<sup>82</sup> enim ad naturam copulatae hypostaseon singularitatem ostendunt. Vocatur<sup>83</sup> autem hypostasis, ut quidam dicit, "individuum"; nuncupatur et "persona": *Individuum* quia non est apta in aliud [f. 39v] dividi ut genus et species et si quid simile; *persona* vero ut insignita proprietatibus et alicuius existentiae indicativa; *hypostasis* ut subsistens susceptibilisque proprietatum. Quare hypostases ad invicem differunt proprietatibus; ratione autem naturae conveniunt.

19 THEODORUS vero ABUCARAS de natura personisque sic disputat:<sup>84</sup> Si idem est natura hypostasi, oportet tot naturas esse hominum quot<sup>85</sup> sunt personae. Sed infinitae sunt hominum personae. Una autem eorum natura dicitur. Quare non est idem natura et persona. Et rursus idem:<sup>86</sup> Quoniam Deus, scilicet deitas, non est Pater neque Filius neque Spiritus sanctus, manifestum. Etenim si Deus Pater omnino non est Filius Deus quoniam Pater quidem est Deus, Deus vero non omnino Pater, et Filius similiter Deus sanctusque Spiritus. Quare Deus non est aliquis horum trium sed neque omnes hii tres existit Deus. Nam si Deus Pater est et Filius Spiritusque sanctus, omnino necesse quod Deus existit esse Patrem et Filium sanc-

<sup>78</sup> Trinitate MS. The passage: Idem ... confessione is a summary of what follows in St. Basil's letter. PG 35, 883B.

<sup>79</sup> Cf. *Adv. Eunom.* II, 4; PG 29, 578C. Basil, *Ep.* 38, 8; PG 32, 339C.

<sup>80</sup> Hugh of Honau, *Lib. de div.* XVIII, 5; fol. 143: Item Basilius *Contra Eunomium* dicens: Hypostasis est concursus circa singularia proprietatum. *Ibidem*, XVIII, 9; fol. 143v: Ex qua nominis ratione orta est descriptio qua Basilius *Contra Eunomium* disputans ait: Hypostasis est substantia cum proprietatibus. *Ibidem*, XVIII, 10; fol. 144: Cum ait Basilius *Contra Eunomium*: "Hypostasis est substantia cum proprietatibus", dedit hypostasi suam propriam descriptionem. Sed cum addidit: "vel hypostasis est concursus circa singularia proprietatum", personae descriptionem tradidit hypostasi.

<sup>81</sup> Hugh of Honau, *Lib. de div.* XVIII, 12; fol. 144: Idem Basilius... adiecit: Nam collectio singularium proprietatum communi substantiae adveniens hoc aliquid significat. Cf. Porphyry, *Isag.* III, 11; CSEL 48, 234.

<sup>82</sup> Hugh of Honau, *ibidem*: (Basilius) subiecit: Proprietates enim ad naturam copulatae hypostaseon singularitatem ostendunt.

<sup>83</sup> Cf. John Damascene, *Dialectica*, 29; PG 94, 590BC. *De natura composita* 6; PG 95, 119C. Hugh of Honau, *Lib. de div.* XVIII, 6; fol. 143: ... declarat Basilius *Contra Eunomium* ita inquit: Vocatur autem hypostasis, ut quidam dicunt, individuum; nuncupatur et persona: individuum quia non est apta dividi in aliud ut genus et species et si quid simile; persona vero ut insignita proprietatibus et alicuius existentiae indicativa; hypostasis ut subsistens susceptibilisque proprietatum.

<sup>84</sup> Cf. *Opusculum* II; PG 97, 1487D and Anastasius, *Viae Dux*, 8; PG 89, 126A.

<sup>85</sup> quod MS

<sup>86</sup> *Opusculum* II; PG 97, 1478D: Quoniam... non omnes tres est.

tumque Spiritum. Atqui unusquisque eorum Deus existens perfectus non omnes ires est. Quare non est deitas persona una neque omnes simul.

20 IOHANNES quoque DAMASCENUS<sup>87</sup> ait: In tribus perfectis personis unam simplicem substantiam superperfectam intelligimus. Et rursus idem:<sup>88</sup> Aliud quidem est re discernere ac aliud intellectu<sup>89</sup> et ratione. In creatis quidem personarum divisio re discernitur. Re namque Petrus a Paulo discretus videtur. At vero communitas et copulatio ratione ac intellectu deprehenditur. Mente namque speculamur quod Petrus atque Paulus eiusdem naturae sint unamque communem naturam possideant. Nam unusquisque eorum animal est rationale et mortale. Communis<sup>90</sup> autem natura haec est ratione comprehensibilis, personae vero non sunt intra se cum ab invicem discretæ sint loco, spatio, tempore, consilio, fortitudine, forma, figura, habitu, complexione, dignitate,<sup>91</sup> studio aliisque proprietatibus. Et idcirco dicuntur plures homines.

21 In<sup>92</sup> sancta vero et supersubstantiali et incom [f. 40] prehensibili omniumque suprema Trinitate sit e converso. Nam ibi commune quidem et unum re inspicitur propter coaeternitatem et identitatem substantiae, actionis, voluntatis et consilii concordiam, potestatis quoque virtutis et bonitatis identitatem unumque splendorem motionis. Una enim substantia, una divinitas, una virtus, una voluntas, una actio, una potestas, una et eadem, non tres similes. Verum<sup>93</sup> intelligentia sola quod divisum est personarum comprehenditur. Unum namque Deum cognoscimus in solis proprietatibus: paternitate scilicet, filiatione ac processione secundum causam et causativum.

22 Et rursus idem<sup>94</sup> ex voce theologiae GREGORII<sup>95</sup>: Individua enim in divisis, si oporteat breviter dicere, deitas et velut in tribus solibus habitis invicem indistanter et una lucis complexio et conexio. Cum igitur ad deitatem quidem respiciamus et primam causam et monarchiam, et unum et idem deitatis, ut ita dicam, motum et consilium et substantiae et virtutis et actionis et dominationis identitatem unum est quod imaginamur. Cum vero ad ea in quibus est deitas vel, ut expressius sit dicere, quae sunt deitas ex prima causa inde sine tempore existentia aequaliter et indistanter, hoc est personas, tria sunt quae adorantur: unus Pater; Pater qui est sine principio, non enim ex aliquo; unus Filius; Filius qui non est sine principio, hoc est sine causa, ex Patre enim; quod si a tempore sumas principium et sine principio, factor enim est temporum, non est sub tempore; unus quoque Spiritus; Spiritus sanctus proveniens quidem ex Patre, non filialiter sed processibiliter.

23 Amplius idem:<sup>96</sup> Discrete<sup>97</sup> quidem Pater dicitur et Filius et Spiritus causa et causativum, ingenitum et genitum et procedens quae non significant substantiam sed habitudinem existendique modum.<sup>98</sup> Haec quidem scientes et per haec ad

<sup>87</sup> *De Fide orth.* I, 8; PG 94, 824A.

<sup>88</sup> *De Fide orth.* I, 8; PG 94, 827AD.

<sup>89</sup> intellectum MS.

<sup>90</sup> The following is abbreviated: PG 94, 887B.

<sup>91</sup> dignitate MS.

<sup>92</sup> *De Fide orth.* I, 8; PG 94, 828A.

<sup>93</sup> The sentence: Verum... comprehenditur is transposed.

<sup>94</sup> *De Fide orth.* I, 8; PG 94, 830B-831A.

<sup>95</sup> Gregory Nazianzen, *Or.* 31, 14; PG 35, 149A.

<sup>96</sup> *De Fide orth.* I, 10; PG 94, 838C-839A.

<sup>97</sup> discre MS.

<sup>98</sup> modium MS.

divinam substantiam deducti non in ipsa<sup>99</sup> comprehendimus sed quae circa ipsam, quemadmodum si cognoscamus quod anima sit incorporea, sine loco et figura, non iam substantiam eius compre [f. 40v] hendimus sed quae circa substantiam neque quid sit corpus cognoscimus eo quod percipiamus ipsum album vel nigrum.

24 Et rursus idem:<sup>1</sup> Quoniam diversa est a persona substantia multotiens dictum est et quod substantia communem et comprehensivam speciem hypostaseon demonstret ut Deus homo. Hypostasis autem individuum significat, videlicet Patrem, Filium, sanctum Spiritum, Petrum, Paulum.<sup>2</sup> Sciendum igitur quod deitatis et humanitatis nomen substantiarum scilicet naturarum exhibitivum est ut Deus et homo de natura praedicantur cum dicimus: Deus est incomprehensibilis substantia et unus est Deus. Accipitur autem et de personis, dicente<sup>3</sup> Scriptura: *Propterea unxit, te Deus, Deus tuus*.<sup>4</sup> Ecce enim Patrem et Filium manifestavit.

25 Sed<sup>5</sup> enim hominis natura in Christi persona est. Dicit enim *Apostolus: Resuscitavit et condes nos fecit Deus in Christo*.<sup>6</sup> Hoc autem dicimus quoniam communium substantiarum unio facta est. Omnis enim substantia communis est omnium sub ipsa contentarum personarum. Non est enim invenire particularem singularemque naturam, scilicet substantiam, alioquin necesse personas easdem consubstantiales et diversae fateri substantiae; sanctam quoque Trinitatem consubstantialem et diversae fateri substantiae secundum deitatem. Eadem igitur natura in singulis personis inspicitur. Et quidem cum dicimus naturam Verbi incarnatam secundum beatos Patres ATHANASIUM et CYRILLUM deitatem dicimus unitam<sup>7</sup> carni. Ideo non possumus dicere naturam Verbi passam. Non enim passa est deitas in Christo. Dicimus naturam humanam passam in Christo fuisse, non hominum aliorum personas.

26 Quare "naturam Verbi" dicentes ipsum Verbum significamus. Sed LEONTIUS BYZANTINUS<sup>8</sup> de natura dictum intellexit, non de persona, quoniam natura Verbi incarnata est i.e. una<sup>9</sup> carni dictum est. Naturam vero Verbi passam carne<sup>10</sup> nondum audivimus. Christum in carne passum didicimus. Quare personam monstrat [f. 41] dicendo naturam Verbi incarnatum fuisse. Sed quod deitas homo facta sit aut incarnata aut humanata numquam audivimus sed quod deitas unita sit humanitati in una personarum eius didicimus. De unaquaque personarum Deus nomen dicitur; deitatem vero de persona dicere non possumus. Deitatem Patrem solum aut Filium solum aut Spiritum solum dici non audivimus. Deitas enim naturam monstrat, Pater autem personam sicut humanitas naturam, Petrus per-

<sup>99</sup> (in ipsa) read: ipsam

<sup>1</sup> *De Fide orth.* III, 4; PG 94, 998AB.

<sup>2</sup> Hugh of Honau, *Lib. de div.* XVIII, 2; fol. 142<sup>v</sup>: Inde et Johannes Damascenus hypostasim dicit significare individuum, ex voce Gregorii Theologi inquires: Hypostasis autem individuum significat. Et... adiecit eorum exempla tam in divinis quam in humanis personis ita: scilicet Patrem, Filium, Spiritum sanctum, Petrum, Paulum.

<sup>3</sup> descende MS. John Damascene's text is slightly abbreviated.

<sup>4</sup> *Ps.* 44:8.

<sup>5</sup> *De Fide orth.* III, 5; PG 94, 1007A.

<sup>6</sup> *Eph.* 2:6.

<sup>7</sup> unitatem MS.

<sup>8</sup> bytantii MS. Cf. Leontius Byzantinus, *Adv. arg. Severi*; PG 86 (II) 1919D. See also *De Sectis* 8, 2; PG 86(I), 1254A. John Damascene, *De Fide orth.* III, 11; PG 94, 1025.

<sup>9</sup> read: unita.

<sup>10</sup> read: in carne.

sonam. Deus autem et commune naturae significat et de singulis personis dicitur denominative. Deus est enim divinam habens naturam et homo qui humanam.

27 Amplius<sup>11</sup> idem: Filius Dei humanatus est, non Pater neque Spiritus. Namque Filius Dei Filius hominis factus est, incarnatus de sancta Virgine sed non excessit Filii proprietatem. Et iterum idem: Non poterit<sup>12</sup> duas naturas mater Dei neque duae naturae in cruce suspensae sunt quarum altera quidem increata altera vero creata. Non enim naturae nasci est sed personae; similiter crucifigi, resurgere atque assumere vel assumi i.e. ascendere.

28 Amplius:<sup>13</sup> Quidam philosophus sic distinguit: humana sane natura non est persona; quod patet ex Incarnationis dispensatione. Dei enim Verbum naturam non personam, hominis assumpsit. Iuxta vero eundem modum<sup>14</sup> divina natura non est persona. Alia est enim ratio naturae, alia<sup>15</sup> personae. Si idem esset natura et persona, cum Dei Filius eiusdem naturae sit cum Patre, cum illo eiusdem esset personae. Sed attendendum dicit quod Aristotelica naturae definitio praesens non attingat negotium quae huiusmodi est: *Natura est initium motus et quietis in quo principaliter existit et non secundum accidens*.<sup>16</sup> Initium autem non temporis sed efficientis causae nominat.

29 Est autem quod dicitur huiusmodi; *Natura est* virtus quae facit in nobis motum et quietem. *In quo est principaliter* dictum est ad distinctionem artis extrinsecus moventis, fabrefacta scilicet natura in naturalibus fundata eorum *motus et quietis existit*. Et tria dicit hoc nomine ARISTOTEL[is. 4lv]LEN significare: materiam communem omnibus subiectam, formam qua ipsa informatur, et quod Graece dicitur *ecfysis*<sup>17</sup> i.e. progrediendi aptitudo a potestate in actum. Ostendit quoque hic idem a natura differre substantiam. Substantia enim sine subsistente non existit. Naturas autem plures invenimus sine subsistente ut irae, amoris, temporis, falsi, aliorumque plurium.

30 Ceterum non sunt praetereundi huius haereseos assertores qui sunt, ut ANASTASIUS meminit, hii: DIOSCORUS,<sup>18</sup> TIMOTHEUS, GALANUS, JULIANUS,<sup>19</sup> PETRUS FULLO, BARSANUFIVS, THEODOSIVS, SEVERUS et EUTYCHES, qui, arguere volentes Chalcedonensem Synodum duas naturas in uno Christo confitentem, idem esse personam et naturam publice ausi sunt praedicare.<sup>20</sup> Asserebant enim usque ad tempus NESTORII Christum in duabus fuisse naturis; post NESTORIUM<sup>21</sup> autem una Christus natura fuit. Et in irritum omnes Patrum voces cessere. Impossibile namque suspicabantur supra dicti viri humanam naturam sine hominis persona posse subsistere. Unde vociferando dicebant quid faciemus quod ecclesiastica tradidit consuetudo Christum unam personam duas habere naturas?<sup>22</sup>

31 Cum igitur apud Alexandriam constituti<sup>23</sup> pariter affirmarent idem esse naturam et personam, Domino de caelis prospiciente, orthodoxi dixerunt: Non ex-

<sup>11</sup> *De Fide orth.* IV, 4; PG 94, 1108 (abbrev.).

<sup>12</sup> *supple*: dici genuit... *id.* IV, 7; PG 94, 1113 (abbrev.).

<sup>13</sup> Not found.

<sup>14</sup> *suprascriptum*.

<sup>15</sup> *aliae MS.*

<sup>16</sup> Anastasius, *Viae Dux*, 8; PG 89, 139A. Aristotle, *Phys.* II, 1; 192, b, 21.

<sup>17</sup> *ekphysis*. See Aristotle, *P. A.* 2, 4, 6.

<sup>18</sup> *Viae Dux*, 6; PG 89, 107B.

<sup>19</sup> Iulianus MS.

<sup>20</sup> *Viae Dux*, 10; PG 89, 187D.

<sup>21</sup> Nestorum MS.

<sup>22</sup> *Viae Dux*, 10; PG 89, 150A.

<sup>23</sup> *constituta corrected to constituti MS.*

communicemus neque Synodum neque pontificum aliquem sed subscribamus<sup>24</sup> communiter definientes quod ubi nominatur natura, ibi necessario significatur persona. Non est enim natura sine persona. Et sic forte in unitatem ecclesiae redibunt.<sup>25</sup> His ita peractis, haeretici plurium sanctorum auctoritates protulerunt personam sancientes naturam naturamque personam.

32 At venerabilis vitae ANASTASIUS<sup>26</sup> protulit magni CYRILLI auctoritatem quam induxerat in Ephesina Synodo: Videte, inquit, sancti Patres [f. 42] consubstantialem Christum dixerunt Patri secundum deitatem et consubstantialem nobis eundem secundum humanitatem, duplicem substantiam, scilicet naturam, confitentes sed non duplicem hypostasim, scilicet personam. Induxit quoque sancti PROCLI hanc auctoritatem:<sup>27</sup> Unus Filius non naturis in duas personas divisus sed stupenda dispensatione duabus naturis in unam personam coniugatis; aliorumque sanctorum similes auctoritates. Quibus auditis haeretici confusi siluerunt<sup>28</sup> populusque coepit dicere: Si natura persona est masculini sexus incende<sup>29</sup> sanctos Patres duas in Christo asserentes naturas.<sup>30</sup>

33 Quod si non est natura persona, sine crimine invenitur Synodus Chalcedonensis quae dicit duas unitas<sup>31</sup> esse naturas et in una Christi persona.<sup>32</sup> Rursusque inclamabant: Si natura personam monstrat masculini sexus, incende<sup>33</sup> ante omnes CYRILLUM dicentem inconfuse Christi permansisse naturas. Quod si non est natura persona, in vanum garritis contra ecclesiam Dei dicentes quod natura sit persona.<sup>34</sup> Post tales vociferationes idem dicere coeperunt: Da Theodosiano et Gaianitae quod quaerit. Statimque deperit. Hoc est: Concede illi quod natura personam significet. Erubescit dicere coactus sanctos Patres Nestorianos aut Synodum Chalcedonensem sine crimine confiteri.<sup>35</sup>

34 Quare inquit<sup>36</sup> ANASTASIUS: Manifestum, quod si idem esset natura et persona, ut sunt tres personae in Trinitate sic essent tres naturae aut una existente natura una erit et persona. Et iterum:<sup>37</sup> Si idem est natura et persona, sunt autem Christi duae naturae et erunt et duae personae. Non est ergo idem natura et persona. [f. 42v] Monstrat autem hic idem vir<sup>38</sup> quod neque Christus sit compositus, ut res componi solent, nec eius natura aliquo modo composita sit in hunc modum: Nihil per generationem compositum vocabulum admittit ut quod ex quattuor elementis componitur neque ignis est neque aer neque aqua neque terra sed aliud ab aliis.<sup>39</sup>

<sup>24</sup> suscribamus MS.

<sup>25</sup> *Viae Dux*, 10; PG 89, 150BC.

<sup>26</sup> *Viae Dux*, 10; PG 89, 158C.

<sup>27</sup> *Viae Dux*, 10; PG 89, 159A.

<sup>28</sup> *Viae Dux*, 10; PG 89, 159D.

<sup>29</sup> The translation in Migne reads: Si persona est natura, tolle, exure sanctos patres.

<sup>30</sup> *Viae Dux*, 10; PG 89, 159D.

<sup>31</sup> unitates MS.

<sup>32</sup> *Viae Dux*, 10; PG 89, 162A.

<sup>33</sup> PG 89, 162A: Si natura perficiat personam, tolle, ure ante omnes...

<sup>34</sup> *Viae Dux*, 10; PG 89, 162A.

<sup>35</sup> *Ibidem*.

<sup>36</sup> Inquit MS. John Damascene, *De natura composita*, 2 and 5; PG 95, 115C and 119B.

<sup>37</sup> *De natura comp.*, 5; PG 95, 119AB.

<sup>38</sup> *De natura comp.*, 1; PG 95, 114A.

<sup>39</sup> Cf. *Viae Dux*, 2; PG 89, 79B and 87B.

35 Dominus<sup>40</sup> autem Noster Iesus Christus ex divinitate et humanitate atque in deitate et humanitate Deus est perfectus et dicitur, et totus Deus et totus homo; quod in nullo compositorum reperiri<sup>41</sup> potest. Non enim<sup>42</sup> totum corpus ignis est vel aer sive terra seu aqua. Neque totus mulus equus est neque totus asinus. Christus autem perfectus Deus et perfectus homo. Quare non est compositus sed in naturis consistit duabus ipsa eius persona. Sed neque natura eius composita est. Nam si unus compositae naturae Christus esset, ex deitate scilicet et humanitate, non esset Patri consubstantialis cum Patris non sit composita natura sed simplex.<sup>43</sup>

36 Amplius:<sup>44</sup> Neque matri esset consubstantialis, cum ipsa non sit ex deitate composita et humanitate. Amplius:<sup>45</sup> Si Christi natura composita esset, aut passibilis esset aut impassibilis.<sup>46</sup> Quod si passibilis, non esset Deus; si impassibilis, non esset homo. Servat enim quaecque natura suam differentiam. Increatum deitas; creatum humanitas; impassibile deitas; passibile humanitas et similia.

37 Et<sup>47</sup> sciendum, inquit, quod deitas neque in Veteri neque in Novo Testamento apparuisse invenitur alicui. Etenim omnibus quibus apparuit personae conformationem intuiti sunt, non ipsam [f. 43] Dei naturae substantiam. Danieli enim ut antiquus dierum humana specie apparuit. Esaias quoque humanae formae visionem se vidisse testatus est dicens: *Vidi Dominum meum sedentem super solium excelsum et elevatum*.<sup>48</sup> Non divinam naturam intuitus est sed in quadam specie personam sicut videri poterat.

38 Cuius<sup>49</sup> rei causa est, ut videtur, quod inflammati sancto Spiritu Patriarchae et Prophetae non ipsam communem naturam sanctae Trinitatis hoc est trium personarum plenitudinem Patris et Filii et<sup>50</sup> sancti Spiritus sed unam de tribus personis incarnandam fore cognoverunt in novissimis diebus. Praeterea non deitatem sed personam venturam praedicaverunt. Nam cuiusque personae vocabulum hoc aliquid significat.

39 Et hypostasis quidem, ut quidam sancti dicunt, duo repraesentat:<sup>51</sup> subsistentiam scilicet simpliciter secundum quod idem est substantiae. Qua de re quidam sancti Patres nominaverunt hypostases "naturas". Aliquando autem significat hoc aliquid; secundum quam significationem dicitur individuum. Porro natura quale aliquid et rei veritatem significat.<sup>52</sup>

<sup>40</sup> John Damascene, *De natura comp.* 1; PG 95, 114AB: Dominus noster... eius persona.

<sup>41</sup> reperi MS.

<sup>42</sup> enit MS.

<sup>43</sup> Cf. John Damascene, *De nat. comp.*, 2; PG 95, 114C.

<sup>44</sup> *De nat. comp.*, 2; PG 95, 114C and 115B.

<sup>45</sup> Abbreviated from *De nat. comp.*, 8 and 9; PG 95, 122D; 123A; 126A.

<sup>46</sup> impossibilitatis MS.

<sup>47</sup> *Viae Dux*, 8; PG 89, 131C.

<sup>48</sup> *Is.* 6:1.

<sup>49</sup> Cf. *Viae Dux*, 11; PG 89, 194BC.

<sup>50</sup> et cancelled by dots.

<sup>51</sup> repraesentant MS. Cf. Leontius Byzantinus, *Scholia*; PG 86 (II), 2011C. John Damascene, *Dial.*, 42; PG 94, 611AB. *De nat. comp.*, 6; PG 94, 119C.

<sup>52</sup> Hugh of Honau, *Lib. de div.* XVI, 2; fol. 141v: Unde Anastasius in disputatione contra Nestorianos: Hypostasis quidem, ut sancti dicunt, duo repraesentat: subsistentiam scilicet simpliciter secundum quod idem est substantiae. Qua de re quidam sancti Patres nominaverunt hypostases "naturas." Aliquando autem significat hoc aliquid secundum quam significationem dicitur "individuum."



40 THEOLOGUS etiam GREGORIUS de natura et persona talia loquitur: Naturae, inquit, duae sunt Deus et homo quia anima et corpus, Filii vero non duo.<sup>53</sup> Amplius: ANASTASIUS,<sup>54</sup> inquit, primus et solus aut valde cum paucis ausus est manifeste trium personarum unam deitatem et substantiam in scripto confiteri.<sup>55</sup> Et rursus in eodem sermone: Nam cum una sit substantia et tres personae a nobis pie intelliguntur atque ab Italis similiter qui non possunt propter suae linguae angustiam nominumque penuriam et dividere a substantia hypostasin ideoque [f. 43v] inducunt personas, ut non tres substantiae suscipiantur.<sup>56</sup> Et hoc quidem naturam monstrat deitatis; hoc autem personarum proprietates.<sup>57</sup>

41 Item in *sermone sanctorum luminum*, theofaniorum scilicet: deitas dividitur indivisibiliter et, ut ita dicam, copulatur divisibiliter. Una enim in tribus deitas et tria unum in quibus deitas.<sup>58</sup> Item in primo *sermone de Filio*: Monarchiam non una persona describit sed naturae coaequalitas constituit.<sup>59</sup> Et iterum: Natura genniminis<sup>60</sup> est idem esse generati secundum naturam. Agenesia<sup>61</sup> vero et generatio non sunt idem. Quibus autem conveniunt haec, idem.<sup>62</sup> Et rursum: Quid eorum, quae sunt, sine causa? Deitas. Nullus enim causam dicere habet Dei aut quod aliquid sit Deo antiquius.<sup>63</sup>

42 Idem in secundo sermone: Pater maior causa Filio, aequalis vero natura.<sup>64</sup> Amplius: Christus dicitur propter deitatem; unctio enim haec humanitatis.<sup>65</sup> Item in *sermone de Spiritu*: Inconfuse servantur tres personae in una natura et substantia deitatis.<sup>66</sup> Et post modicum: Unius adoratio trium est adoratio eo quod in tribus aequalitas sit dignitatis et deitatis.<sup>67</sup> Et post paululum: Unus Deus quoniam una deitas et ad unumquemque ex ipso relationem habent et si tria credantur.<sup>68</sup> Et iterum: Apud Graecos etiam dicitur quod deitas sit una et apud nos una humanitas genus universum.<sup>69</sup>

43 Similiter autem sancta Nicaena Synodus<sup>70</sup> inter naturam dividit et personam. Sic enim clamat: Dicentes<sup>71</sup> "Erat quando non erat" Filius Dei "et, antequam nasceretur non erat et quod ex non extantibus factus sit aut ex alia persona" vel sub-

<sup>53</sup> John Damascene, *De nat. comp.*, 7 (PG 95, 122B) copied from Gregory Nazianzen, *Ep.* 101 (to Cledonius); PG 37, 179A.

<sup>54</sup> read Athanasius.

<sup>55</sup> *Or.* XXI, 33 (in laudem Athanasii); PG 35, 1123A.

<sup>56</sup> *Or.* XXI, 35; PG 35, 1123D-1126A.

<sup>57</sup> This last sentence should be placed after *intelliguntur*.

<sup>58</sup> *De Luminibus* 11, 4; CSEL 46, 121 (lines 15-17). PG 36, 346D-347A.

<sup>59</sup> *Or.* XXIX, 2 (de Filio); PG 36, 75B.

<sup>60</sup> This appears to be a transliteration of the Greek *gennêma* used by St. Gregory. Cf. *De sancto et imm. Deo* II, 18; PL 202, 327C: Quemadmodum genimen...

<sup>61</sup> agenesia *MS*.

<sup>62</sup> *Or.* XXIX, 10; PG 36, 87A.

<sup>63</sup> antiquus *MS*. *Or.* XXX, 2; PG 36, 106B.

<sup>64</sup> *Or.* XXX, 7; PG 36, 111C.

<sup>65</sup> *Or.* XXX, 21; PG 36, 131B.

<sup>66</sup> *Or.* XXXI, 9 (de Spiritu s.); PG 36, 143A.

<sup>67</sup> *Or.* XXXI, 12; PG 36, 146C.

<sup>68</sup> *Or.* XXXI, 14; PG 36, 147D.

<sup>69</sup> *Or.* XXXI, 15; PG 36, 150B.

<sup>70</sup> Mansi 2, 666. *Viae Dux*, 9; PG 89, 142A.

<sup>71</sup> The Greek term *hypostasis* is translated *substantia* by St. Hilary (PL 10, 536B).

stantia<sup>72</sup> asserentes Filium Dei convertibilem vel alterabilem esse hos excommunicat sancta et universalis<sup>73</sup> et apostolica ecclesia." Ecce<sup>74</sup> Dei dicunt *ex alia persona* vel *ex alia substantia*. Aliud fatentur esse personam aliudque substantiam. Quod confir[f. 44]mando rursus dicunt:<sup>75</sup> Nam Patrem scimus Patrem et Filium Filium et Spiritum sanctum Spiritum sanctum, unam quidem substantiam, tres personas. Nam dixerunt tres personas. Non dixerunt tres naturas sed unam naturam et tres personas, aliud esse definientes<sup>76</sup> substantiam aliudque hypostasin, quae numerum suscipit, substantia vero nequaquam.

44 Et idcirco Graecorum hoc modo ecclesia distinguit: 'Deus' vox naturam atque hypostasin consuevit significare; 'deitas' vero naturae solius significativum est, comprehensivum quidem personarum deitas ut natura merito dicitur. At non est deitas aqua<sup>77</sup> personarum quas continet. Nam cum sit in personis, persona esse non potest.

45 Quem sermonis<sup>78</sup> tenorem augustissimus legislator IUSTINIANUS in principio sui *Codici*, christianae religionis Imperatores GRATIANUS<sup>79</sup>, VALENTINIANUS, THEODOSIUS immutabiliter tenendum sanxisse profitetur huiusce verbis: Cunctos<sup>80</sup> quos clementiae nostrae regit imperium<sup>81</sup> in tali volumus lege servari,<sup>82</sup> quam divinum Petrum Apostolum tradidisse Romanis religio usque adhuc<sup>83</sup> ab ipso insinuata declamat,<sup>84</sup> quamque Pontificem DAMASUM<sup>85</sup> sequi claret et PETRUM Alexandriae episcopum, virum apostolicae sanctitatis, hoc est, ut secundum apostolicam disciplinam evangelicamque doctrinam Patris et Filii et Spiritus sancti unam deitatem sub pari<sup>86</sup> maiestate et sub pia Trinitate credamus.<sup>87</sup>

46 Quare huius sacrae ac nullatenus violandae constitutionis omniumque superiorum inductarum auctoritatum reus existit qui personam dicit esse naturam seu na-[f. 44v]turam fatetur esse personam. Haec autem vobis scripta sunt non canoris sonitibus sed aliquatenus obtusioribus benevolentiam<sup>88</sup> dirumpente silentium sumque in multitudine voluminum brevitae usus quoniam flos, si non properat ad fructum, phoebeis flammis aduritur. Explicit.<sup>89</sup>

*Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies.*

<sup>72</sup> The Greek word *usia* is translated *essentia* by St. Hilary.

<sup>73</sup> unidiversalis MS.

<sup>74</sup> *supple*: Filium.

<sup>75</sup> dicunt MS. The argument is copied from *Viae Dux*, 9; PG 89, 142BC.

<sup>76</sup> diffinientes MS.

<sup>77</sup> The reading is quite clear.

<sup>78</sup> Sermonem MS. *Cod. Justin.* I, 1, 1; ed. P. Krueger 2 (Berlin, 1915) 5: Impp. Gratianus, Valentinianus et Theodosius... Trinitate credamus.

<sup>79</sup> The MS reads Mart.

<sup>80</sup> populos Krueger.

<sup>81</sup> temperamentum Krueger.

<sup>82</sup> (lege servari) religione versari Krueger.

<sup>83</sup> ad nunc Krueger.

<sup>84</sup> declarat Krueger.

<sup>85</sup> damascum MS.

<sup>86</sup> patri MS.

<sup>87</sup> Hugh Etherian quotes Justinian twice in *De sancto et imm. Deo* III, 16; PL 202, 375C.

<sup>88</sup> It may also mean *bene violentiam*.

<sup>89</sup> The text ends on the sixth line and is followed by the librarian's entry of ownership: *Liber domus sancti Augustini in Marbach Ordinis Canonicorum Regularium Basiliensis dyocesis*.

# An Essay on the "Novi Cives" and Florentine Politics, 1343-1382

MARVIN B. BECKER

ONE of the most striking features of Florentine communal history is the progressive democratization of the city's political life brought about by the entry of new citizens, *novi cives*, into the Signoria. During its earliest days, rule over the primitive urban commune was the exclusive preserve of the Florentine aristocracy and the great rural proprietors of Tuscany. At that time, throughout the twelfth century, the city was a signorial center and its organization a medieval configuration of lay and ecclesiastical liberties, immunities, prerogatives and privileges. During the course of the next two and a half centuries we witness the erosion of these traditional rights and the emergence of forms, procedures and practices that mirror the aspirations and interests of a changing urban society. This society was the creation of successive waves of immigrants who flocked to the city in hope of increasing their patrimony and augmenting their status. This mass exodus from rural Tuscany produced a quantitative change which is relatively easy to assess, for the phenomenal urban growth of the city is a fact of number.<sup>1</sup> Much more difficult to determine, however, is the qualitative effect of these migrations on the political character of Florentine life. Here, perforce, the question must gravitate around the changing nature of the rapport between the newcomers and the established patriciate, and this is not a fact that can be expressed statistically. Alterations in the relationships between classes and the attendant modifications in social

<sup>1</sup> For recent studies on Florentine demography, see E. Fiumi, 'La demografia fiorentina nelle pagine di Giovanni Villani,' *Archivio Storico Italiano*, CVIII (1950), 78-158; P. Battara, *La popolazione di Firenze alla metà dei 500* (Florence, 1935) and 'Le indagini congetturali sulla popolazione di Firenze fino al Trecento,' *Archivio Storico Italiano*, XCIII (1935), 226-227; B. Barbadoro, 'Finanza e demografia nei ruoli fiorentini d'imposta del 1352,' *Atti del Congresso Internazionale per gli Studi sulla Popolazione* (Rome, 1931), 13-34. Few documents survive for the North Italian countryside before 1200. Cf. F. Schneider, *Die Entstehung von Burg und Landgemeinde in Italien* (Berlin, 1924). On the origins of the city, see M. Lopes Pegna, *L'origine di Firenze* (Poggibonsi, 1957). For a penetrating analysis of the heightened state of economic activity in the Florentine *contado* during the thirteenth century, see J. Plesner, 'Una rivoluzione stradale nel dugento,' *Acta Jutlandica*, X (1938), pp. 29 ff.

feelings and political sentiments lead the investigator to that land from which few who are committed to the teachings of rational psychology ever return; even more rare is the devotee of irrational psychology who upon his return is able to communicate his experiences. If the history of ideas, as Nietzsche has suggested, walks across time on dove's feet, then how is one to follow the even more delicate traces made by the nuances of social change on the fourteenth century? The rich documentation is starkly public and frankly economic, and there is little evidence to illuminate the interior social universe of the Florentines. The illusiveness of the quarry is no reason for abandoning the hunt, but the trail has been so little explored and so ill-defined that one must forego the more conventional and more rigorous methodological approaches in favor of flexible and impressionistic techniques.

Throughout the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries new men were to exert great pressure upon the Florentine government for a larger voice in the disposition of political matters. In 1343, concerted patrician resistance to this trend broke down and the perseverance of the new men was finally rewarded when they were given a share in public life and became an integral part of communal politics.<sup>2</sup> They were to continue to play a decisive role in the civic arena until the closing decades of the century. Participation of these men in the day to day activities of the government was to alter irrevocably the political environment of the republic and to encourage the transformation of the commune into a territorial state. Their continued presence was also to be instrumental in modifying the political behavior and attitudes of certain of the old established families. The present inquiry will attempt to describe these changes and to assess the character of the novel relationships that emerged between the new men and the patriciate. An understanding of this change is essential not only for an insight into the intricate workings of communal politics, but also as a basis for making historically intelligible the new political sentiments that were coming to the fore

<sup>2</sup> Between 1343 and 1348 approximately one-half of the 270 members of the priorate, the highest communal office, were from families who had never sat in the Signoria before. Cf. M. Becker, 'La esecuzione della legislatura contro le pratiche monopolistiche delle arti fiorentine alla meta del secolo quattordicesimo,' *Archivio Storico Italiano*, CXVII (1959), 15-16. For a discussion of the electoral reforms of 1343, see G. Brucker and M. Becker, 'The *Arti Minori* in Florentine Politics, 1342-1378,' *Mediaeval Studies*, XVIII (1956), 96-97. One-half of the new men were matriculated in the major guilds and the remainder were enrolled in the *arti minori*. The model for this type of statistical analysis is presented by N. Ottokar in *Il Comune di Firenze alla fine del dugento* (Florence, 1926), pp. 26-27.

between the 1340's and 80's. Finally, the period from 1343 to 1382 was chosen because it was during these four decades that the new men exerted their greatest influence upon public life. They were not a significant factor in communal politics either in the 1330's or in the latter half of the 80's.

### THE BACKGROUND OF THE NOVI CIVES

The term *novi cives* is used in this paper to designate the most affluent segment of those immigrants who had only recently established residence in the city, gained Florentine citizenship and begun to take an active part in civic affairs after 1343. Differences between these new men and the older notable families were of degree rather than of kind. The latter were the scions of the most prosperous urban houses who themselves had been *novi* four or five generations back, while the former had lately come from the thriving families of the Tuscan countryside.<sup>3</sup> Both were matriculated in the guilds, masters of their own shops and employers of labor. Therefore, there was fundamental unanimity between these men on a variety of economic questions. The same type of accord obtained in agricultural matters, since patrician and new man alike were owners of extensive rural holdings. This compatibility of interests was further reinforced by joint business ventures, partnerships, monetary obligations and marriage ties.

The character of the *novi cives*, and consequently the tone of Florentine politics, was deeply influenced by changes that had occurred outside the city walls. The environs of Florence had gradually become a microcosm of the city and during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries the economic and social milieu of the countryside was coming to resemble more and more that of the metropolis. The *contado* was not the exclusive preserve of the great magnates; much land had come into the hands of the free peasants and rural bourgeoisie. Feudal conditions now tended to be limited to those less populated districts most remote from the city or to those areas still dominated by the old noble houses of the Counts Guidi, the Pazzi of Val d'Arno and the Ubaldini. Feudal restrictions on person and property were disappearing throughout the countryside. Agricultural labor was being hired when available, land

<sup>3</sup> This statement and the general description that follows is based upon an impressionistic reading of the materials found in the cartularies of the early Florentine notaries. Cf. *Archivio Notarile*, A. 981-983, B. 1238, 1473, 1948-1950, 2527, C. 102, I. 104-105, M. 293, 490-491, P. 413, R. 40, 159. I was unable to locate L. 76, listed in the inventory as the cartulary of Ser Lapo di Gianni (1298-1327).

was being bought and sold in brisk fashion and estates rented or let for shares to free peasants, rural artisans, notaries and merchants. Crafts, trades and home-industries had taken hold in the rural communes and *popoli* of the *contado*; goods were circulated during the course of its manufacture to small shops, each of which, like its urban counterpart, was more or less independent. These developments over a two and a half century period stimulated diversity of occupation, heterogeneity of production techniques, varieties of skills as well as a wide experience in a mobile quasi-urban environment which made it possible for men to transfer their sphere of socio-economic activity from the *contado* to the city with a minimum of trauma. Therefore, the *novi cives* cannot be classified as immigrants if the term implies a startling shift in life patterns. Even after they had entrenched themselves in the city, their ties with the *contado* remained firm. So strong were these bonds that the distinction between city and countryside became blurred.<sup>4</sup>

Those new men who acquired Florentine citizenship were from the wealthiest and most influential classes of the *contado*. Patterns of migration reveal that this stratum was the first to leave the countryside for the city and that they were soon followed by families only a little less prosperous. This trend, persisting until the middle years of the fourteenth century, had the effect of leaving the poorer elements to cultivate the land. The Signoria designed communal legislation to dissuade these serfs and agricultural laborers from abandoning their traditional calling and used the power of the courts to prevent them from severing their legal ties with rural Tuscany.<sup>5</sup> The results of a recent study of the countryside support the conclusion that in territories under Florentine jurisdiction, the phrase "Stadtluft macht frei," had little meaning.<sup>6</sup> The new citizens of Florence were not the fugitive slaves and miserable serfs described by historians of a generation ago such as Davidsohn, Pardi and Caggese, but rather they were scions or affluent country families who could well afford to establish residence in the city, purchase real estate and erect a dwelling, pay urban imposts over a period of from five to ten years and still have sufficient capital to matriculate in one of the Florentine guilds and open up shop.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>4</sup> E. Fiumi, 'Fioritura e decadenza dell' economia fiorentina,' *Archivio Storico Italiano*, CXVI (1958), 443-509.

<sup>5</sup> E. Fiumi, *op. cit.*, pp. 484-487; P. Santini, *Documenti dell' antica costituzione del comune del Firenze* (Florence, 1895), pp. 51, 391.

<sup>6</sup> J. Plesner, *L'émigration de la campagne à la ville libre de Florence au XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Copenhagen, 1934), p. 119; N. Ottokar, *op. cit.*, pp. 123 ff.

<sup>7</sup> See Plesner's telling critique of these older interpretations in *op. cit.*, pp. 116-122.

In many instances, before the new men could be transformed into *veri, antiqui et originari cives*, they had to be sponsored by prominent Florentines who were willing to go surety for them and vouch for their continued good behavior.<sup>8</sup> On other occasions the new men were held responsible for posting a sizable bond.<sup>9</sup> They were also required to demonstrate that they were "true *amatores* of the city" and men with deep commitments to the principles of Florentine Guelfism.<sup>10</sup> Since the atmosphere of the medieval city-state was intimate and personal, the origins, ancestry, backgrounds, allegiances and opinions of those who petitioned for citizenship were well known to the Signoria and when the communal councils voted on these requests, this information became a matter of public record. Men who had served the republic well on the battlefield established particularly strong claims on Florence's affection which paved the way to citizenship, and conversely those whose loyalties were suspect found themselves confronted with formidable obstacles. Those guardians of political orthodoxy in Florence — the *Parte Guelfa* — kept detailed dossiers on the juridical status, regional ties and political reliability of the would-be citizens and their families. Since the captains of the *Parte* and other advisory bodies played an important role in the selection of new citizens, the reputation of the aspirant came under careful scrutiny. When a truly prominent applicant petitioned, eminent members of this panel would speak reassuringly about his qualifications.<sup>11</sup>

The entry of the *novi cives* into civic life was a gradual and complex process. There was a protracted interval during which they were given an opportunity to become familiar with the working of the intricate Florentine political system. Their earliest experiences in this realm came with their participation in guild affairs. These corporations were the very foundation of the Florentine constitutional system and as

<sup>8</sup> All documents cited in this article are to be found in the *Archivio di Stato* in Florence. *Libri Fabarum*, 37, fols. 76r-82 (21 June to 8 July 1356). (Henceforth this source will be abbreviated as *L.F.*) *Provisioni*, 43, f. 165 (17 October 1356). (Henceforth this source will be abbreviated as *P.*) *P.*, 51, f. 8r; *L.F.*, 37, f. 56 (21 August 1363). On occasion, as many as eighty-four Florentines acted as *fideiussores* for the *novo homo*.

<sup>9</sup> *P.*, 45, f. 105r (12 December 1357). The amount averaged 200 lire. There is one instance in which the new citizen agreed to make a loan to Florence of 500 florins and it is interesting to note that he was declared immediately eligible for office. Cf. *P.*, 47, f. 98 (23 December 1359).

<sup>10</sup> *P.*, 45, f. 86r (23 October 1357); *P.*, 45, f. 105r (12 December 1357).

<sup>11</sup> Conversely, the chances of the petitioner would be damaged if an influential Florentine, such as a Rossi, Tornaquinci or Strozzi, were to speak against him. Cf. *L.F.*, 34, f. 118r; *L.F.*, 35, f. 10; *L.F.*, 39, f. 211r.

such they played a crucial role in communal politics. It was not possible to hold elective office without being inscribed in one of the twenty-one guilds enumerated in the Ordinances of Justice of 1293. Great political questions were debated in the guild halls as well as in the communal councils and the *novi cives* could familiarize themselves with the pressing issues of the day. Several times a month the membership was called by the Signoria to give advice in the Palazzo Comunale on a variety of civic matters ranging from an over-all realignment of foreign policy to the most inconsequential details of public administration. Under the aegis of the guilds some of the most memorable legislation was initiated; it was drawn up by members and presented to the Signoria by the guild captains in petition form, and after being approved of by the communal councils, became the law. In drawing up these proposals, the *novi cives* gained first-hand knowledge of civic problems such as the relationship between the church and commune, the distribution of the republic's grain supply, the feasibility of hiring mercenaries and the procedures to be employed in the eradication of the tyranny of political factions. The guilds also operated in a judicial capacity, maintaining their own courts and prisons; therefore, the *novi cives* were able to gain experience in the law.

The Signoria required the *novi cives* to serve a period of political apprenticeship before they could move from guild affairs into public office. They were not to be admitted into the priorate or its colleges, nor were they to be permitted to serve in the sensitive post of guild captain for a period ranging from ten to twenty-five years.<sup>12</sup> These stipulations had the effect of institutionalizing a Florentine *cursus honorum* whereby the novice progressed gradually through the lower offices acquiring political experience until finally he was eligible for membership in the supreme magistracies of the republic. He participated in guild affairs, sat in the communal councils and served in the various administrative posts of the city and *contado* before assuming the grave responsibilities of high office. Until the 1340's *novi cives* were rarely entrusted with the charge of carrying out communal foreign policy. Diplomatic missions were staffed almost exclusively by the most renowned patricians, since these men were the best harbingers of the city's prestige. Similarly, offices in the status-worthy Court Merchant and in the most illustrious of all Florentine organizations — the *Parte Guelfa* — were the sole preserve of great tycoons and the aristocratic set.

<sup>12</sup> *P.*, vols. 40-66.



The entrenched families were willing to see the *novi cives* represented in the commune provided that the overwhelming preponderance of power remained in their hands. Since the majority of newcomers were enrolled in the minor guilds, the tendency was to restrict the number of seats open to the *minori* in such critical offices as the priorate, the colleges and the communal treasury. In 1343 a serious challenge was launched against this system of apportionment which had obtained for almost half a century, when the new men from the major guilds joined the *minori* and succeeded in gaining greater representation. An epidemic of bankruptcies, an empty communal treasury and a disastrous experiment with despotism discredited the patriciate and made it difficult for them to resist the demands of the new men.<sup>13</sup> In the past the *novi cives* had pressed hard for a voice in the Signoria; they won ephemeral victories in 1293, 1323 and 1328. In part, their dissatisfaction with the status quo and their persistence stemmed from the political backgrounds of these affluent immigrants. Before they settled in the city, this group had long dominated the social, economic and political life of their native rural parishes.<sup>14</sup> They had exercised great influence over the local assemblies and established their right to participate in the election of officials empowered to dispense justice and levy taxes. They themselves served as consuls, rectors and syndics, and regularly represented their *popolo* before the various Florentine courts. It was during these sessions that vital issues concerning the recruitment of military forces, the responsibility of the *popolo* for maintaining roads, bridges and fortifications, and methods for raising communal revenue were debated. These men of the *popoli*, *castelli* and rural communes zealously guarded their hard won prerogatives against all who sought to dispute them. They contended against feudal lords and church dignitaries on questions of liability for corvees, ownership of lands, payment of rents and the right to elect functionaries. They petitioned

<sup>13</sup> For a comprehensive treatment of these bankruptcies, see A. Saponi, *La crisi delle compagnie mercantili dei Bardi e dei Peruzzi* (Florence, 1926). *Tratte*, 1155, contains the names of all bankrupts from the letter 'A' through 'S,' and was to be used for the purpose of barring the *falliti* from communal office. The *Atti del Podestà* and the *Camera del Comune* contain additional names, and bring the total to 300.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. J. Plesner, *op. cit.*, pp. 63 ff.; A. 981-983. During the middle years of the fourteenth century, many of the new men had sufficient capital to undertake the profitable and vital role of farming communal taxes. See especially, *Camera del Comune*, 56, f. 190. (Henceforth this source will be abbreviated as C.C.) Cf. also C.C. 58, f. 134; C.C., 59, f. 60; C.C., 172, unnumbered folios; *Scrivano*, 3, unnumbered folios. Less than five per cent of those communal office holders whose descent can be traced, had immediate ancestors who were agricultural laborers.

the Signoria for prorogation of levies, challenged communal claims that they were responsible for the crimes committed by exiles and criminals in their quarter of the *contado* and requested reductions in tax assessments.<sup>15</sup>

The new citizens were then accustomed to exercising political power in the *contado* and, therefore, upon arrival in the city they were not without expectancies in this area. They also had much to offer the republic beyond their varied experience on the level of everyday politics, for prominent among their number were many from the learned professions. The lawyers and notaries who were particularly conspicuous in their ranks brought a theoretical knowledge of techniques of administration and political procedures. As the functions of communal government became more diverse and complex, the legal training of these *novi cives* became more indispensable to the republic.<sup>16</sup> Throughout the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, the Signoria's responsibilities mounted as Florence extended her rule over Tuscany with the consequence that her bureaucracy proliferated. Few members of the patriciate were willing to undertake careers in a civil service that was both underpaid and held in disrepute.<sup>17</sup> Therefore, we find the *novi cives* coming to occupy a variety of critical administrative posts, especially in the middle years of the Trecento, while at the same time being denied entry into the more prestigious offices of the commune, guild courts and *Parte Guelfa*.

#### THE NOVI CIVES: "UPSTART PEOPLE" OR RESPONSIBLE CITIZENS?

The Florentine chroniclers and men of letters heaped abuse and invective upon the *novi cives* because they were without lineage, renown

<sup>15</sup> *C.C.*, 1<sup>142</sup>. This is the first complete set of treasury records running from October of 1342 to July of 1343 and contains a great variety of materials pertaining to the relations between the city and the countryside. Earlier documents of the *Camera* are so fragmentary that they cast little light on this question.

<sup>16</sup> Sixty-five per cent of all notaries who held communal office, between 1343 and 1382, came from families recently migrated to the city. While their numbers increased in the rapidly growing civil service, their representation in the Signoria declined by one-half. This statement is based upon a comparison of the number of seats held from 1328 to 1342 with those occupied from 1343 to 1348. The holdings of this group in the funded communal debt averaged 200 florins.

<sup>17</sup> Notable exceptions to this statement are to be found in every prominent Florentine family. However, those who assumed this type of career were frequently the least affluent. For the names of these men, see *C.C.*, vols. 1-30. All employees of the commune were required to pay a tax on their salaries and, therefore, their names are recorded in the *Camera*.

or manners, and yet they were willing to acknowledge their right, no matter how theoretical, to hold office.<sup>18</sup> This fundamental ambiguity in attitude towards the newcomers was reflected in the writings of the most important of all the Trecento Florentine historians—Giovanni Villani. On the one hand he stoutly maintained that a “buono reggimento” should extend representation to all citizens matriculated in the guilds, on the other, he launched his most bitter attacks against the regime of 1343-48—the most democratic in communal history—because it was dominated by the new men, “artisans, manual laborers and idiots... who cared little for the republic and knew less about governing it.”<sup>19</sup> In Giovanni’s opinion, the *novi cives* were arrogant parvenus, devoid of civic spirit, whose presence constituted a menace to the proper conduct of statecraft, and yet they were an essential ingredient in the government. The constitution of 1343 which extended representation to the *novi cives* was theoretically an “ordine assai comune e buono,” but it broke down when put into practice.<sup>20</sup> This position is far removed from that of a Dante or a Boccaccio who blamed these “upstart people” for lowering the tone of civic morality; these poets longed for a return to the golden days of just government when a homogeneous ruling class was not threatened by discordant elements.<sup>21</sup> Dante lamented that “the citizenship” was being contaminated by the new rustics from Campi, from Fighini and from Certaldo who were responsible for the malignant growth of factionalism in Florence.<sup>22</sup> It was these self-same men, only recently

<sup>18</sup> By the late 1330’s, the idea of *Buon Governo* for the Tuscan communes involved a commitment to the belief that representation should be extended to the *grandi*, *mezzani* and *minori*. Discussions held by the Florentine government reveal that this Aristotelian ideology was grounded on very practical considerations, for this was the only way that the city could be preserved in *statu pacis* and *scandala* could be avoided. Cf. *Consulte et Pratiche*, vols. 12, 14. (Henceforth this source will be abbreviated as *C.P.*) Florence was anxious to see an end to civic discord in neighboring states because such strife was an open invitation to foreign powers to intervene. Even when a city was in *statu popularis*, representation must be accorded the nobles so that there will be concord and unity. Cf. *C.P.*, 9, f. 26r; *C.P.*, 11, f. 105r. For a general treatment of the artistic implications of this theme, see N. Rubinstein, ‘Political Ideas in Sienese Art,’ *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, XXI (1958), 179-207.

<sup>19</sup> G. Villani, *Cronica*, ed. F. G. Dragomani (Florence, 1845), XI, 118; XII, 43.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, XII, 72.

<sup>21</sup> C. T. Davis, *Dante and the Idea of Rome* (Oxford, 1957), pp. 97 ff. The destruction of civic virtue at the hands of the immigrants is one of the persistent theses of thirteenth century Florentine historiography. Cf. N. Rubinstein, ‘The Beginnings of Political Thought in Florence,’ *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, V (1942), 198-225.

<sup>22</sup> *Paradiso* XVI, 46-68, 145 ff.; *Epistola* VI; G. Boccaccio, *Genealogiae deorum*, IV, 31.

arrived from places ludicrously named Capalle, Cilicciavole, Sugame and Viminiccio, who had only yesterday laid aside the trowel and plough who were now, in the judgment of Boccaccio, the agents of the city's undoing: "Their minds are filled with insatiable avarice and overweening pride, so that, seeking not the public welfare but their own, they have brought misery to the city and now seek to enslave it." Why is it that Giovanni Villani who shares the prejudices of Dante and Boccaccio against the newcomers takes such pains to defend the right of the *novi cives* to hold communal office? Unlike the two literary figures, his long experience in Florentine politics has taught him that these men have a vital role to play in civic life; they can preserve the republic by acting in concert with other elements of the population who love *libertà* against those "grandi e potenti cittadini" who desire to establish a tyranny or found a despotism. To be sure, the arrogant *novi cives* posed a threat to the sound conduct of communal foreign policy, but this was more than compensated for by the fact that they served as a check against the founding of an aristocratic regime.<sup>23</sup> The history of the thirties and early forties demonstrated clearly, to Giovanni, the dangers implicit in such a Signoria and revealed the value of according representation to the *novi cives*. Citizens had been critical of the outrageous behavior of the aristocracy and Dante certainly let the north winds of his personality loose on them; many joined him in emphasizing the concept of a nobility of virtue rather than of birth, and Aristotle's theory of a mixed constitution was widely diffused throughout the city. But Giovanni Villani was the first chronicler to move from the level of rhetoric and philosophy to that of the *realpolitik* when he came to understand the positive contributions the *novi cives* might make in conserving the republic.<sup>24</sup>

Matteo Villani, the continuator of his brother's chronicle, echoes these same sentiments when he deplores the over zealous political ambitions of the newcomers, each of whom desires to become a prior, and yet he rejoices in the fact that it was a coalition of the greater guildsmen and new middling citizens who frustrated the efforts of the tyrannous aristocrats when they sought to establish absolute dominion over the Signoria. He is perfectly willing to agree with Boccaccio that

<sup>23</sup> G. Boccaccio, *Lettere volgari* (Florence, 1834), p. 12; H. Baron, 'The Social Background of Political Liberty in the Early Italian Renaissance,' *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, II (1960), p. 443.

<sup>24</sup> For a more detailed treatment of this topic, see M. Becker, 'The Republican City State in Florence: An Inquiry into its Origin and Survival (1280-1434),' *Speculum*, XXXV (1960),

the new men are vulgar and lack "liberal studies," that they are self-seeking and intemperate and that they are without the virtues of the *antichi moderati* who had governed the city so wisely in the distant past, but he parts company with the poet when he lavishes praise upon those merchants, artisans and men of middling status who resolutely and courageously opposed the craven policies of the *grandi* and *potenti*, and in so doing, these *novi* saved the republic.<sup>25</sup>

The leading chroniclers of the second half of the fourteenth century saw the prime threat to the traditional liberty of the city in very different terms than did Dante. It was not the influx of people from the countryside that menaced Florentine *libertà*, but rather the political machinations of the old and venerable families who dwelled within the city walls. Alarm over the *bestie fiesolane* is replaced by a pervasive fear that ancient clans such as the Albizzi will establish a tyranny. There is also a deep-seated suspicion that these oligarchs are anxious to barter away the city's cherished freedoms in return for private advantage and personal power.<sup>26</sup> The first step in their quest for domination over the Signoria would involve the ousting of the *novi cives* from office. Those who stand in opposition to these intrigues now find themselves in the unaccustomed position of defending the new men against their high-born adversaries. No longer are the *novi cives* charged with spreading the virus of factionalism throughout the city and undermining the "Roman inclination towards order and good government," but rather the Albizzi and that dread bastion of the Florentine aristocracy — the *Parte Guelfa* — are held responsible for the many ills that beset the republic.<sup>27</sup>

Certain of the economic policies favored by the *novi cives* were in part

<sup>25</sup> G. Brucker, 'The Ghibelline Trial of Matteo Villani (1362),' *Medievalia et Humanistica*, XIII (1960), 52-53.

<sup>26</sup> M. Villani, VIII, 103; *Cronica fiorentina di Marchionne di Coppo Stefani*, ed. N. Rodolico, *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores*, new ed., XXX, part I (Città di Castello, 1903-1955), rub. 720, 726. The fears expressed by the chroniclers are echoed by the advisors to the Signoria who urge that the government be wary of the action taken by its patrician ambassadors lest the city lose its *libertà* at the hands of secular rulers and ecclesiastical princes. Cf. *C.P.*, I, unnumbered folio (14 March 1355). Spokesmen for the colleges admonished the government to restrain the Albizzi in order that they remain subject to the communal regime. Cf. *C.P.*, 12, f. 100 (8 April 1373). Similarly, they beseeched the priors to make certain that the captains of the *Parte* submit "to the will of the commune." *C.P.*, 8, f. 55r (18 March 1367).

<sup>27</sup> The captains of the *Parte* were accused, in the council halls, of fomenting suspicion among the citizenry, creating disunity and acting in such a manner as to discredit the Guelf cause in Florence. Cf. *C.P.*, 2, f. 159r (20 January 1360); *C.P.*, 4, fols. 101r-102r (24 September 1363).

the cause for this transvaluation of values whereby they gained stature in the eyes of their contemporaries. The entry of the new men into communal government on a large scale in 1343 altered the tone of Florentine politics but did nothing to disrupt the socio-economic base of republican society. Approximately half of their number were matriculated in the greater guilds and these, coupled with the older office holders, also from the *arti maggiori*, meant that the seven greater guilds could count upon holding three-fourths of the seats in the Signoria. The remainder were occupied by new men from the fourteen minor guilds who were selected from the most affluent segment of the artisan, shop-keeper world.<sup>28</sup> This distribution of offices was maintained until 1378 and served to guarantee the political hegemony of the *maggiori*. The silk guild more than doubled its representation in the Signoria over the preceding fifteen year period and the holdings of the new men from this rapidly burgeoning major guild in the funded communal debt averaged the considerable sum of 142 florins. The wool guild likewise increased its allotment of high communal offices and the new men from this guild also owned extensive *Monte* holdings. The shares held by the *novi cives* matriculated in the twenty-one guilds (major and minor) averaged the impressive sum of fifty-seven florins. The tax assessments of this new group of office holders stood in a ratio of five to six and a half in comparison to those imposed upon members of the urban patriciate.<sup>29</sup> Therefore, we should not be surprised to find that these wealthy newcomers, possessors of extensive capital, and themselves employers of labor, were in substantial agreement with the patriciate on many facets of communal economic policy. All the guild masters joined forces to stamp out rebellious movements among the Florentine workers in the years between 1343 and 1345. The new government stripped *il popolo minuto* of the privileges and unaccustomed status recently conferred upon it by the ousted despot, Walter of Brienne.<sup>30</sup> In formulating agrarian policy this Signoria rigidly adhered to the traditional program and remained unsympathetic to any innovation that might threaten the interests of the great landed proprietors. From 1348 on, the regime enacted

<sup>28</sup> The holdings of these men in the funded communal debt of 1345 averaged fifty-seven florins. G. Brucker and M. Becker, *op. cit.*, p. 101.

<sup>29</sup> M. Becker, *op. cit.*, p. 47.

<sup>30</sup> *Atti del Capitano*, 17, f. 72. For a further consideration of this question, see M. Becker, 'Some Aspects of Oligarchical, Dictatorial and Popular Signorie in Florence, 1282-1382,' *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, II (1960), 425-429.

various ordinances designed to depress the wages of agricultural laborers and buttress the authority of their masters.<sup>31</sup> The incidence of taxation on those who owned land in the city and countryside remained virtually unchanged throughout this period. On the vital question of monetary policy, the new government followed the lead of the merchants of the wool guild and reformed the Florentine coinage system: the value of the gold florin in which the merchants received payment for cloth was augmented, while the silver coinage with which the merchants paid their workers was depreciated.<sup>32</sup> Vintners, iron-mongers, hosiers and doublet makers willingly gave their support to petitions presented by the greater guildsmen.<sup>33</sup> A seller of oil and a coopersmith favored a request by the wool guild asking that their rectors be granted immunity from communal law.<sup>34</sup> The new representatives in the government also championed the cause of the hard-pressed Florentine banking houses and as a result, the government was able to win precious time for these harassed companies so that they might postpone making restitution to their creditors.<sup>35</sup>

This consensus on fundamental economic problems did not preclude the existence of certain areas of disagreement. However, these tended to be peripheral and while they did serve to alienate some elements of the patriciate from the *novi cives*, there was a substantial segment of older families who were not dissuaded from seeking the adherence of the new men. According to the testimony of the unusually well-informed chronicler, Donato Velluti, who was much involved in communal politics at this time, these political notables actively sought to win the support of the new men, recently enrolled in the minor guilds, when they championed the repeal of certain legislation which adversely affected the *minori*, since it reduced their representation in government.<sup>36</sup>

<sup>31</sup> N. Rodolico, *Il Popolo Minuto (1343-1378)*, (Bologna, 1899), pp. 173-174. For fines against agricultural laborers who violated these ordinances, see *Ufficiali del Biado*, 102, 12, fols. 1-8 (13 August-1 September 1353). For records of payments made by these men, see especially *C.C.*, 70, fols. 11-30r (6 April-30 April 1358). In 1383, the character of Florentine legislation pertaining to agricultural laborers was altered radically and the Signoria offered many inducements to these men to farm in the *contado*. Cf. *P.*, 72, f. 161r; *L.F.*, 41, f. 116r.

<sup>32</sup> G. Villani, XII, 97; *Statuti della Repubblica fiorentina*, ed. R. Caggese (Florence, 1910-1921), vol. II, p. 279.

<sup>33</sup> *L.F.*, 23, f. 4r; 26, f. 7; *Provisioni Duplicati*, 4, fols. 27, 103.

<sup>34</sup> *P.*, 48, f. 133; *L.F.*, 36, f. 39r.

<sup>35</sup> M. Becker, 'Florentine Politics and the Diffusion of Heresy in the Trecento,' *Speculum*, XXXIV (1959), 62-63.

<sup>36</sup> *La cronica domestica*, ed. I. del Lungo (Florence, 1914), p. 242.

Therefore, despite the presence of such vexing questions as the establishment of price ceilings on goods and services, the enforcement, or lack of enforcement of anti-monopoly legislation, and the sensitive problem of the authority of the guild consuls over those who followed a trade without troubling to enroll in any of the city's minor guilds, there were patricians who realized that a liaison with the *novi cives* could be founded upon a mutuality of interests.<sup>37</sup>

The leaders of the *novi cives* after 1343 came to constitute an elite drawn from the upper echelons of manufacturers and traffickers in domestic goods and services. This wealthy group soon gained the confidence of many of their social superiors with whom they had much more in common than with the humble artisans and shop-keepers of the city. Marco di Benvenuto, a soap manufacturer, who was to play a crucial role in the inauguration of the far-reaching legislative reforms of 1372, was a top rate-payer in his quarter.<sup>38</sup> Pace Brunetti, a leading leather merchant, who also participated in this critical moment of Florentine history, made extensive loans to the commune totaling 250 florins.<sup>39</sup> Niccolo Delli, a grocer and a member of the special commission of ten (*Dieci della Libertà*) who were given sweeping powers in 1372, was a man of great affluence and had been elected to the priorate on several occasions.<sup>40</sup> Tommaso Dini, a prominent member of the Signoria, was one of the new elite who engaged in international trade as a partner in one of the great companies.<sup>41</sup> Giovanni Dini, a druggist and importer of spices, was active in the government throughout the decade of the seventies and became one of the "Eight Saints" who guided the republic in its desperate war against the Holy See; he was rewarded for his service to the state by *il popolo* in 1378 when he was knighted. He and his confreres were commended by Machiavelli for caring more about their country than the welfare of their own souls.<sup>42</sup> The vintner, Valeriano Dolcibene, importer and exporter, twice holder of a seat in the priorate during the decade of the 1350's, speculated

<sup>37</sup> On the problem of anti-monopoly legislation, see M. Becker, "La esecuzione della legislatura contro le pratiche monopolistiche delle arti fiorentine alla meta del secolo quattordicesimo," *op. cit.*, pp. 8-29. On disputes concerning the jurisdiction of guild consuls, see *Atti del Esecutore*, 29, fols. 196r-197; *ibid.*, 40, f. 112.

<sup>38</sup> C.C., 220, f. 17; P., 60, f. 48.

<sup>39</sup> C.C., 68, f. 132r; *Estimo*, 307, f. 2.

<sup>40</sup> P., 60, f. 1; P., 64, f. 129; C.P., 5, f. 108r; C.P., 11, f. 106.

<sup>41</sup> S. Peruzzi, *Storia del commercio e dei banchieri di Firenze* (Florence, 1868), p. 221; C.P., 1, 2, f. 72; *ibid.*, unnumbered folio (24 November 1356).

<sup>42</sup> P., 60, f. 148; L.F., 40, f. 52.



heavily in *Monte* shares and made extensive loans to the Florentine treasury.<sup>43</sup> Tellino Dini, an ironmonger, who was a frequent participant in legislative debates, also engaged in foreign trade and specialized in the acquisition of *Monte* shares. His tax assessments and those of his heirs ranged between twenty-five and fifty florins a year; in addition, he also made sizable loans to the treasury. In the middle years of the fourteenth century, when Florence was in need of funds, he loaned the city no less than 601 florins. His political career began at this time with his election to the priorate; subsequently, he was chosen treasurer of the tax on wine, official over communal property, syndic in charge of fortifications and walls, and finally, he served as ambassador to the city of Siena. He was one of the principal advisors to the Signoria throughout this period; in 1354 he spoke on the crucial question of anti-Ghibelline legislation and the related problem of the *divieto*. His proposals were essentially moderate and in accord with those expressed by certain of the patrician speakers. The following year he advised the Signoria to modify the treaty with the Holy Roman Empire so that the city of Florence might remain *libera*. Once again his judgment coincided with many of the patricians. In the ensuing years he upheld positions taken by such eminent Florentines as Uguccione Ricci and Berto Frescobaldi when he opposed measures deemed detrimental to the interests of the mercantile patriciate. In the 1360's he argued against forming any alliance with the papal legate; in taking this stand, he was in agreement with the opinions expressed by other *novi cives* as well as those voiced by the powerful Ricci family.<sup>44</sup> One of the wealthiest of the new men from the San Giovanni section of the city, Giovanni Goggio, a dealer in used clothing and an importer of grain, also counseled against this proposal. This oft-called upon governmental advisor advanced reasons for his stand which were identical with those of other leading *novi cives* and the chiefs of the Ricci camp: close ties with the church would only serve to threaten Milan and the lords of that city would inevitably take military reprisals against the Florentines.<sup>45</sup> Similar sentiments were expressed by Recco Guazza who stood as one of the main props of the patrician reformers from 1372-1378; he was to

<sup>43</sup> S. Peruzzi, *op. cit.*, p. 122; C.C., 184, unnumbered folio; *Monte*, 439, f. 88; *ibid.*, 441, f. 80.

<sup>44</sup> *Monte*, 436, f. 2r; L.F., 31, f. 5r; P., 44, f. 111r; L.F., 39, f. 246; P., 42, f. 104r; P., 47, f. 123; C.C., 84, f. 9r; *Estimo*, 307, f. 40r; C.C., 69, f. 125r; *Diplomatico*, Opera S. Maria del Fiore (undated); C.C., 184, unnumbered folio (12 August 1378); *Prestanze*, 367, f. 15; C.P., 1, *passim*; C.P., 2, f. 85; C.P., 3, fols. 51, 71, 113r; C.P., 4, fols. 103r, 113; C.P., 5, fols. 6, 24r, 118r.

<sup>45</sup> S. Peruzzi, *op. cit.*, p. 222; C.C., 77, f. 146r; *Estimo*, 307, f. 50; *ibid.*, 355, f. 25; *Monte* of 1345, S. Maria Novella, f. 494; P., 42, f. 104; L.F., 40, f. 56; C.P., 3, fols. 3r, 17r; C.P., f. 27r.

support enthusiastically the radical proposals introduced by that rugged individualist of Florentine politics, the aristocrat, Filippo Bastari Cionetto. Guazza was to champion important measures calculated to undermine the authority of the Tuscan church and to destroy the political influence of the great Albizzi clan; in this he was following the lead of such eminent patricians as Tommaso di Marco Strozzi, Andrea di messer Francesco Salviati, Andrea di Veri Rondinelli and Salvestro de' Medici.<sup>46</sup> Maso di Neri, one of the top rate-payers of his quarter, a rope maker, whose family had only recently migrated from the *contado*, Andrea Niccolini, a wealthy hosier, Schiatta di Ricco, a leading pork butcher and exporter of leather goods, Matteo Federigo Soldi, seven times holder of the office of prior and another of the "Eight Saints," as well as the wealthiest vintner in Florence, Ricco Taldi, a coopersmith and frequent participant in communal debates, and the politically active Andrea Villani, an affluent trader in dyes are representative of that large group of new men who were gaining the reputation for being responsible citizens and trustworthy political allies.<sup>47</sup>

#### THE NOVI CIVES AND POPULAR GOVERNMENT, 1343-78

The problems that the commune faced in 1343 were new and complex. The tone and style of Florentine politics were transformed; never again would it be possible to reconstruct the Guelf political system which had served the city so well over many generations. Fissures had been discernible as early as 1340 but now not even the most sanguine of Florentines could hope to avoid a breach with the twin bulwarks of the Guelf confederation — the papacy and the Kingdom of Naples. The

<sup>46</sup> C.P. 12, fols. 3, 10r-11; P., 64, f. 17; L.F., 40, f. 230; Stefani, rub. 881-83; N. Rodolico, *I Ciompi* (Florence, 1945), p. 188; D. Marzi, *La cancelleria della repubblica fiorentina* (Rocca S. Casciano, 1910), p. 100. Technically, Guazza does not qualify as one of the *novi cives* since his family sat in the Signoria at the end of the *Trecento*. He is included, however, because he, like other Florentines, belonged to families who had been out of public life for over a half century. It is in this sense, then, that his family can be considered *nouveau*. I wish to thank Professor Gene Brucker of the University of California for calling my attention to this fact.

<sup>47</sup> S. Peruzzi, *op. cit.*, p. 221; Stefani, rub. 787; P., 64, f. 129; C.C., 77, f. 151r; *Prestanze*, 369, f. 65r (Maso di Neri). Stefani, rub. 738; P., 60, f. 1; L.F., 40, f. 278; *Monte*, 250, f. 6; F. Perrens, *Histoire de Florence* (Paris, 1877-83), vol. IV, p. 523 (Andrea Niccolini). S. Peruzzi, *op. cit.*, 219; C.P., 4, f. 8; C.P., 10, f. 114; L.F., 33, f. 5r; L.F., 38, f. 27 (Schiatta di Ricco). Stefani, rub. 701, 752; C.C., 87, f. 89; P., 49, f. 135r (Matteo Federigo Soldi). C.P., 8, fols. 12, 17; L.F., 40, f. 36; C.P., 14, f. 18r (Ricco Taldi). S. Peruzzi, *op. cit.*, p. 222; P., 60, f. 148; *Prestanze*, 82, f. 3 (Andrea Villani).

city was unable to sustain its time-honored role as financial fulcrum of this alliance because bankruptcy was imminent. A similar fate lay in store for many of the great Florentine banking houses; Neopolitan barons and high clergy were no longer the commune's Guelf friends, but rather her nagging creditors whose demands could not be satisfied. There were other forces that were working to erode old Guelf ties: persistent papal support for the claims of the deposed, much despised despot, Walter of Brienne, the policies followed by the Holy See in making appointments to the Tuscan church, the meddling of the Inquisitor in secular affairs, the sweeping juridical claims of the ecclesiastical courts and the untimely death of the military captain of the Guelf forces, King Robert of Naples in 1343.<sup>48</sup>

At this juncture, the captains of the twenty-one guilds, two-thirds of whom were *novi cives*, responded to the crisis by presenting two petitions to the Signoria which were adopted by the councils and became part of the statutory law of the realm. These measures were designed to prevent the impatient prelates and Neopolitan barons from using the ecclesiastical courts to press their claims for restitution.<sup>49</sup> During the interval from 1343-47, a combination of old and new men from the guilds acted in concert to strengthen the prerogatives of the secular tribunals. They also made radical innovations in the communal credit structure aimed at averting the city's impending bankruptcy. In the face of bitter ecclesiastical censure, the communal debt was funded and declared to be both negotiable and interest bearing.<sup>50</sup> Throughout the decade of the 1350's speakers for the college of the *gonfaloniere*, where the new men had their greatest representation, persisted in advocating policies that brought the republic into sharp conflict with her old allies. They voiced their disapproval on the matter of sending subsidies to the papal legate and called upon the Signoria to withdraw contingents of

<sup>48</sup> On the question of the relationship between the city's banks and the papacy, see Y. Renouard, *Les relations des Papes d'Avignon et des compagnies commerciales et bancaires de 1316 à 1378* (Paris, 1941). For a detailed analysis of the economic motives behind the split between Florence and the papacy, see A. Saponi, *op. cit.*, pp. 117 ff. On papal policy towards Brienne, see L. Leoni, 'Breve di Clemente VI en favore di Gualtiere di Brienne, duca d'Atene,' *Archivio Storico Italiano*, XXII (1875), pp. 181 ff. The clergy made extensive loans to Brienne in 1342. Cf. C.C., 1<sup>bis</sup>, f. 297r; C.C., 2, f. 4r. On the role of church tribunals and the inquisition in Florence, see M. Becker, 'Some Economic Implications of the Conflict Between Church and State in "Trecento" Florence,' *Medieval Studies*, XXI (1959), 1-16.

<sup>49</sup> A. Panella, 'Politica ecclesiastica del comune fiorentine,' *Archivio Storico Italiano*, vol. II, part IV (1913), 327-365; A. Saponi, *op. cit.*, pp. 197 ff.

<sup>50</sup> B. Barbadoro, *Le finanze della repubblica fiorentina* (Florence, 1929).

Florentine cavalry stationed in the Kingdom of Naples.<sup>51</sup> Spokesmen for this college bitterly opposed any alliance with the Holy See because they believed it would constitute a breach of Florence's treaty obligations with Milan. Consistently they admonished the Signoria not to take any action that might antagonize the powerful Visconti despot and urged the government to maintain a strict neutrality in the hostilities between Milan and the papacy.<sup>52</sup> These views clashed with traditional pro-papal sentiments and caused sharp cleavages among the citizenry. During the 1360's and 70's, successful papal efforts to re-establish dominion over the Patrimony altered dramatically the tone of the foreign policy discussions held by the Signoria. Leading *novi cives* such as Giovanni Goggio, Ricco Taldi and Tellino Dini openly advocated an alliance with Milan to serve as a counter to the ever-growing power of the papacy in territories bordering the republic.<sup>53</sup> Suspicion of ecclesiastical designs against the *libertà* of the city mounted throughout this interval, and by 1375, the church was looked upon as the principal threat to Florentine liberty. Despite assurances by Avignon that the papacy had no territorial ambitions in Tuscany, the new men remained unconvinced and continued to press for the adoption of alternatives far removed from those of traditional Guelfism.<sup>54</sup>

The advocacy of a foreign policy independent of ancient ties with the papacy and Naples placed the new men in opposition to the more

<sup>51</sup> C.P., 1, 2, f. 25; *ibid.*, unnumbered folio (12 March 1355). Tellino Dini's statement to the Signoria expresses the view held by the new men: "Non placet nullo modo legam factam cum legato." Dominus Tommaso Altoviti rejected this proposal in favor of a "lega cum ecclesia." His suggestion was seconded by the prominent patricians, Carlo Strozzi and Andrea Bardi. Cf. C.P., 4, f. 103r. Marco Strozzi urged the Florentines to send troops to Naples as a recompense for the many services rendered to them in the past by the king.

<sup>52</sup> Giovanni Dini advised the Signoria not to send a subsidy to the papal legate because it might offend Milan. Cf. C.P., 12, f. 119r. The same sentiments were voiced by the guild captains. Cf. C.P., 7, f. 6. Ricco Taldi stated that if for any reason it became necessary to send troops to aid the papacy, the government should first take counsel with the citizenry. C.P., 12, f. 72r. Schiatta di Rocco proposed that the government should not contract an alliance with any lord or commune "maiori" than Florence. Cf. C.P., 10, f. 114.

<sup>53</sup> C.P., 9, fols. 21-65.

<sup>54</sup> Communal counselors expressed fear that the Holy See might absorb lands belonging to neighboring Lucca and Arezzo, and that papal lieutenants might intervene in the domestic affairs of Siena and other Tuscan communes, and thus destroy the *libertà* of their citizenry. Cf. C.P., 12, fols. 66-67. Speakers also accused the church of aiding the rebellious Florentine feudatories, the Ubaldini clan, in their war against the city. C.P., 12, f. 77r.

conservative elements of the patriciate captained by Piero degli Albizzi, Carlo Strozzi and later, Lapo da Castiglionchio. These *ottimati* believed passionately that the interests of the republic could best be served by integrating communal policy with that of the Holy See. In 1359 Piero degli Albizzi, backed by the *Parte Guelfa*, induced the Signoria to ally with Cardinal Albornoz, the papal legate. According to the testimony of Matteo Villani, the citizenry were outraged by this manœuvre; such prominent *novi cives* as Tellino Dini advised the Signoria to dispatch an ambassador to the curia in order to reverse the policies initiated by the *ottimati* and the legate.<sup>55</sup> The chroniclers, Villani, Stefani and Velluti concur in the judgment that the Albizzi faction and the Guelf captains were motivated by a desire to aggrandize themselves: rich ecclesiastical benefices and lucrative administrative posts in the papal states were tempting rewards, therefore, the *bene comune* was neglected and the *libertà* of the republic was placed in jeopardy.<sup>56</sup> It was the pro-papal *ottimati* who now posed the chief threat to republican liberty, while the *novi cives* and their allies were counted among its staunchest defenders. Three years later the self-same controversy arose again over the feasibility of war with Pisa. The church and the *ottimati* vigorously opposed this risky venture, while the blacksmith, Andrea Donati, the oil vendor, Andrea Terii, the vintner, Francesco Fabrini, the goldsmith, Nerio and others of their station enthusiastically championed this undertaking.<sup>57</sup>

The same *novi cives* who tended to be suspicious of the pro-papal machinations of the Albizzi faction and wary of foreign entanglements were also hostile to the ancient liberties, prerogatives and immunities enjoyed by the Tuscan church. They were anxious to reduce the authority of the ecclesiastical courts so that the clergy might be brought under communal jurisdiction. They also disputed the time-honored right of sanctuary and favored the imposition of harsh penalties upon criminous clerics.<sup>58</sup> However, the greatest pressure these men exerted was in the area of tax reform. Here the *novi cives* attacked the invidious standards of the medieval commune when they demanded that taxes

<sup>55</sup> C.P., 2, f. 44. See also footnote 51 above.

<sup>56</sup> D. Velluti, *La cronica domestica*, op. cit., p. 253. See also footnote 26 above.

<sup>57</sup> C.P., 4, f. 96; L.F., 36, fols. 130r-135. The statements made by the chroniclers Velluti (p. 240) and Filippo Villani (XI, 102) are borne out by the records of the advisory councils to the Signoria. We note that Piero degli Albizzi, Carlo Strozzi and the Guelf captains consistently advocated peace. Cf. C.P., 3, f. 14; C.P., 4, f. 33r; C.P., 5, fols. 4-4r.

<sup>58</sup> C.P., 1, 2, fols. 132-133; C.P., 3, f. 8; P., 63, fols. 70r-73; L.F., 40, f. 150.

and imposts fall equally upon the clergy and the laity.<sup>59</sup> Another suggestion entailed the appointment of communal officials who were to supervise the execution of wills and administer the endowments of pious foundations and religious confraternities. This zeal for reform was not confined to things ecclesiastical but radiated into many other sectors of civic life. The affluent Schiatta di Ricco (butcher) called upon the Signoria to redistribute the tax burden so that greater equality would prevail among the citizenry; this involved new assessments commensurate with the wealth of each particular quarter of the city. Ricco also suggested that the Signoria elect special officials to review the system of tax rates.<sup>60</sup> The grocer, Niccolo Delli, entreated the Signoria to force those who owed money to the commune to make immediate restitution. As spokesman for the college of the *Dodici*, he pressed for the equalization of forced loans, *prestanze*; this was an ever-present problem and Delli's sentiments were shared by numerous *novi cives* who advised the Signoria on economic matters.<sup>61</sup> More sweeping fiscal innovations were advanced by the *gonfaloniere*, Recco di Guazza, by far the most radical of those *novi cives* whose opinions are recorded in the minutes of the communal legislative debates. This maverick was to become infamous in the eyes of his compatriots for vigorously and successfully championing a drastic reduction in the interest rate on the funded communal debt. Stefani contends that this was the most extreme step taken by the government in over a century and Guazza's name was recorded in the diary of the Curiani family, owners of extensive *Monte* stock, as being "Gonfaloniere di Inguistizia." This inveterate foe of entrenched privilege is first noticed when he speaks up boldly in favor of taxing the clergy and raising the amount of the bond which nobles of certain Florentine territories must post.<sup>62</sup> Shortly thereafter he proposed legislation authorizing the commune to sell property of the Tuscan church; he was counted among the most ardent supporters of the Signoria at the time of the Florentine war with the papacy. For his novel opinions and enthusiasms, he was promptly excommunicated by the church; two years after this ban was proclaimed, he rose in the councils to argue against the re-establishment of the inquisition in Florentine territory. Guazza was the first speaker to congratulate Filippo Bastari Cionetto for his daring oration imploring the Signoria to oust the pro-papal Albizzi family from their commanding position over Florentine politics.<sup>63</sup>

<sup>59</sup> C.P., 4, f. 97; C.P., 14, fols. 48-57r.

<sup>60</sup> See footnote 47 above and C.P., 10, f. 114.

<sup>61</sup> See footnote 40 above.

<sup>62</sup> See footnote 46 above and C.P., 6, f. 118.

<sup>63</sup> C.P., 12, f. 10r.

The *novi cives* warmly espoused the authority of the state as a restraint against the entrenched strength of the great families who tended to be a law unto themselves and the legislation enacted under their aegis reflects this deep concern. They were most anxious to curb the lawlessness prevalent among these *potentes* so that the inhabitants of the city and *contado* might live in peace and tranquility. In 1346 two artisans spoke in favor of legislation designed to curtail the power of the very great clans: these *potentes* were to be prohibited from contracting marriages with the families of any foreign prince, lord or baron, since such an alliance would inordinately increase their status. Any offspring from such a union was to be automatically barred from exercising any jurisdiction and was to be required to pay the heavy fine of one thousand florins.<sup>64</sup> The government also acted to fix severe penalties against any patrician who lawlessly usurped ecclesiastical property.<sup>65</sup> The following year the doublet maker, Dominico Dante, counseled the enactment of a provision canceling the permission to bear arms formerly granted by the commune to certain great families; this was to be done because of the "lamentations" of the citizenry concerning the terrible violence being committed against them daily by the *potentes*.<sup>66</sup> In 1352 a petition was presented by several "peace-loving *populares*" which was seconded by two notaries new to the Florentine political scene. It stated that any commoner who behaved in a lawless manner could be declared a magnate by a vote of the Signoria and the captains of the twenty-one guilds (two-thirds of whom were *novi cives*). The effect of making a citizen a magnate was to deprive him of many of his political rights. For example, he was not to be permitted to sit in the Signoria or hold other critical posts. This petition was amended and then enacted with this preamble: "...in order to conserve and defend the liberty and innocence of the commoners, the poor, the weak and the clergy," those who are convicted under this law are not only deprived of high office, but are not to be permitted to live in the same section of the city as their kinsmen.<sup>67</sup> The threat of vendetta or reprisal by the relatives of lawless Florentines encouraged the government to take steps to weaken the *consorteria* of the powerful clans. In 1361 further inroads were made into the authority of the great families when a law was enacted compelling all those who had formerly been classed

<sup>64</sup> *Provisioni Duplicati*, 6, f. 144.

<sup>65</sup> P., 33, f. 18r.

<sup>66</sup> *Provisioni Duplicati*, 7, f. 66r.

<sup>67</sup> P., 39, f. 192.

as *magnati* (nobles) but whose legal status had been transformed by action of the Signoria to that of *popolani* (commoners) to appear before the priorate and renounce their *consorteria* (family ties). Florentines whose status had been altered in this way were not to be permitted to hold office in the Signoria for two decades.<sup>68</sup> Other severe measures were taken to reduce the influence of the patriciate over the communal courts: anyone seeking dispensation from a verdict of these tribunals was obliged to present a petition to the Signoria which required a three-fourths vote for approval, then it had to be ratified by a two-thirds vote of the communal councils.<sup>69</sup> Legislation of this type was implemented by various directives issued by the Signoria to the judiciary stating that sentences were not to be suspended; special officials were elected to enforce this mandate.<sup>70</sup> The coopersmith, Guido Pizzini, the doublet makers, Augustino Cocchi and Francesco Bonaiuto, the furrier, Piero Neri del Zancha, the grocer, Giovanni Dini and the hosier, Andrea Niccolini were but a few of the many *novi cives* who enthusiastically battled for the supremacy of communal law against the time-honored prerogatives of the established patriciate.

The *novi cives* warmly supported the Ordinances of Justice which increased the penalties on lawless nobles and required this class to post bond as a guarantee for their good behavior. One of the first measures taken by the popular Signoria of 1343 was to restore these "most fortunate ordinances," which had been abrogated by the preceding regime. The government was also much concerned with their vigorous enforcement.<sup>71</sup> In 1349 the wine merchant, Federigo Soldi, the notary, Ser Jacobo Gherardi and three other new men, Jacobo Mezze, Francesco Benin and Puccio Carletti favored extending the liability for any crime committed by a member of a noble house to his kinsmen even as distant as the sixth degree.<sup>72</sup> The hosier, Augustino Cocchi, spoke in behalf of legislation requiring all nobles who desired to serve abroad to first obtain the permission of the government.<sup>73</sup> The notary, Ser Piero Guccio, supported the proposal that would reinstitute the practice of permitting commoners to deposit secret denunciations against lawless *magnati* in a special box affixed to the door of the court of the Executor

<sup>68</sup> P., 68, f. 164.

<sup>69</sup> P., 43, f. 1.

<sup>70</sup> L.F., 36, f. 6; L.F., 34, f. 31.

<sup>71</sup> P., 32, f. 73; Stefani, rub. 607, 616-617.

<sup>72</sup> C.P., 1, 1, f. 5.

<sup>73</sup> L.F., 24, f. 20.



of Justice.<sup>74</sup> Spokesmen for the colleges favored the exaction of special taxes to be levied against the nobility of the *contado* and, in the company of Recco Guazza, suggested that this class be compelled to increase their bond.<sup>75</sup> Particular suspicion was harbored against certain noble families who had a long and dishonorable history of disloyalty to the republic and who were overly given to committing acts of violence and brigandage. By a provision of the Signoria and the councils, the Adimari, Bastichi, Della Tosa, Donati, Gherardini, Giandonati, Rossi and Visdomini families were singled out for special retribution.<sup>76</sup> At the same time, certain members of less powerful and more law-abiding noble houses were permitted to renounce their status and enroll in the ranks of the commoners in order to avoid the restraints imposed upon the *magnati*. By a special decree of the popular regime in October of 1343, 530 Florentine nobles were permitted to change their class affiliation.<sup>77</sup> This practice was continued and in the summer of 1349, an extra-ordinary commission was appointed by the Signoria to select those *magnati* considered to be most worthy of commoner status. Many of these new *popolani* changed their names, separated themselves from their consorts and relinquished their coats-of-arms, and yet popular distrust of these former *grandi* and *potenti* persisted.<sup>78</sup> In 1371, two *novi cives*, Bernardino Cini Bartolini and Ser Nigio ser Giovanni, seconded a proposal to extend the political disabilities imposed upon former *magnati*.<sup>79</sup> By taking these measures the Signoria was able to reduce the numbers of the nobility, set strict limits upon the political participation of former members of this class and weaken the force of dynastic ties, while at the same time buttressing communal prerogatives. This movement came to be intensified during the 1370's when the *novi cives* were to play an even larger role in communal politics. By the summer of 1378 this trend had broadened into a frontal assault which divested the *magnati* (referred to anachronistically in the pertinent documents as "milites") of other ancient rights and destroyed the effective force of their clan ties.<sup>80</sup>

<sup>74</sup> This measure was designed to prevent crimes by nobles against "libertatem et statum popularium." The magnate, Piero Foraboschi, spoke against its adoption. Cf. *P.*, 48, f. 30.

<sup>75</sup> *C.P.*, 1, 2, f. 130r; *C.P.*, 6, f. 118.

<sup>76</sup> *P.*, 37, f. 99; *L.F.*, 30, f. 46.

<sup>77</sup> Stefani, rub. 595; G. Villani, XII, 23.

<sup>78</sup> Stefani, rub. 748; *P.*, 40, f. 39.

<sup>79</sup> *P.*, 58, f. 164.

<sup>80</sup> *Balie*, 16, fols. 2r-6; *P.*, 66, f. 51; *L.F.*, 40, f. 298.

The tendency to exalt the authority of the state at the expense of the privileges of the great families was a dominant theme during those intervals when the *novi cives* were well-represented in the government. This motif was both implicit in the many condemnations handed down by the republic's courts against those lawless *magnati* and *popolani* who appropriated communal rights and property for their own use and in the numerous attempts of the various popular Signorie to compel the culprits to make restitution of their usurpations. In 1344 the courts fined sixty-two members of the Bardi family a total of 3,000 florins on this count. The Bondelmonti and Pazzi were also condemned to pay 5,161 lire and 3,249 lire respectively on similar charges, while the eminent Rossi and Della Tosa were obliged to restore extensive communal properties to the treasury.<sup>81</sup> The following year a provision was enacted stating that the republic was desperately in need of revenue and, the Signoria was enjoined to recover "the property and rights of the city so that Florence might continue to live in *libertate et iustitia*."<sup>82</sup> In 1349 three new men counseled the enactment of even more stringent legislation framed to achieve this end and speakers of the college of the *gonfaloniere* such as Antonio Niccoli and Andrea Fei continued to urge further reforms in this area.<sup>83</sup> Special commissions were created whose chief function was the preservation of the perquisites of the republic and the strengthening of the jurisdiction of the civil tribunals. The founding of these *balie* and the extension of their prerogatives was enthusiastically advocated by Recco Guazza and other new men. Soon these *novi cives* were to gain the support of certain public-spirited opponents of the factions such as the political independents, Giovanni Magalotti, Filippo di Cionetto Bastari, Caroccio Alberti, Andrea Francesco Salviati, Francesco Vigorosi and last but not least, Salvestro de' Medici.<sup>84</sup>

The chronicler Stefani was particularly well-informed about the events of these years since, in addition to serving on the *balia* of the *Dieci della Libertà* and later acting as a fiscal officer for this commission, he also was a key Florentine diplomat and was frequently in attendance at communal council meetings. He tells us that the *Dieci* forced the great families to restore the possessions of the republic and this

<sup>81</sup> C.C., 6, fols. 72r-89; C.C., 7, fols. 115-117; C.C., 17, f. 6r; P., 33, f. 43.

<sup>82</sup> *Provisioni Duplicati*, 5, f. 64.

<sup>83</sup> C.P., 12, f. 175; L.F., 29, fols. 23-24.

<sup>84</sup> These men were all instrumental in displacing the Albizzi and Ricci from communal politics. Stefani, rub. 731; P., 60, f. 2r; P., 64, f. 17. For their political opinions, see especially C.P., vol. 12.

information is substantiated by documentary evidence. But what is much more significant, the chronicler calls attention to the steps taken by this *balia* to undermine the authority of the great lords in the *contado*.<sup>85</sup> This movement to extend republican jurisdiction into the outer reaches of the countryside and to bring these remote territories "under the arm of communal justice" was accelerated in the late 1370's and early 80's and culminated with the destruction of the liberties, immunities and exemptions of the great Florentine feudatories, the Counts Guidi and Ubaldini in 1384. Stefani provides us with an insight into the motives of the new men whose energies contributed so much to the rise of state power. This group, according to the chronicler, harbored a deep resentment towards those *grandi* and *potenti* who used their privileged position to commit numerous extortions against their inferiors.<sup>86</sup> Stefani and an anonymous *priorista* make particular mention of those nobles and mighty commoners who used the church courts and the power of ecclesiastical office to oppress the less puissant.<sup>87</sup> These patricians held a monopoly of high church positions in Tuscany and it was this group, in the opinion of the Signoria of July, 1375, who exploited the Florentines — "especially the *populares* and artisans *sub calore iusticiae*." By their actions, these lawless and factious men threatened the liberty of the city and prevented the people from conducting their affairs in peace and tranquility.

#### THE PARTE POPOLARE: MERCHANTS AND ARTISANS

Like the chroniclers Matteo Villani, Velluti, Stefani and Morelli, the sentiments of the Florentine Chancellor, Coluccio Salutati, the foremost humanist of his generation, reflect a fundamental reinterpretation of the character of the republic's politics.<sup>88</sup> No longer are the *novi cives* depicted as the principal threat to the proper conduct of civic life. It is the intransigent, factious, pro-papal segment of the urban patriciate that now poses the most serious challenge to the orderly workings of communal politics. It is these immoderate men, in the opinion of Salutati, who are responsible for the enormous excesses committed in the

<sup>85</sup> E. Fiumi, 'Fioritura e decadenza dell' economia fiorentina,' *op. cit.*, p. 492; *C.P.*, 12, f. 175.

<sup>86</sup> Stefani, rub. 588; M. Becker, 'Un avvenimento riguardante il cronista Marchionne di Coppo Stefani,' *Archivio Storico Italiano*, CXVII (1959), 137-146.

<sup>87</sup> N. Rodolico, *I Ciompi* (Florence, 1945), p. 42; Stefani, rub. 616.

<sup>88</sup> E. Garin, 'I cancellieri umanisti della repubblica fiorentina da Coluccio Salutati a Bartolomeo Scala,' *Rivista Storica Italiana*, LXXI (1959), 185-195.

name of traditional Guelfism. Using the prestige and power of the *Parte Guelfa*, nobles and great *popolani* sought to control Florence and formulate policy that would assure the triumph of the pro-papal cause. This would necessarily involve catapulting the philo-papal Albizzi faction into power through devious techniques of political proscription. Any who withstood this tide were to be denounced as "Ghibellines" and driven from office. It was this stratagem that provoked an undeclared civil war in the city of Florence.

In this campaign of vilification the *novi cives* and their adherents were logical targets, since their objectives frequently clashed with those of the captains of the *Parte* and the Albizzi faction. The popular government of 1343 which reduced the influence of the great families, extolled the impersonal force of communal law and promoted a foreign policy independent of Avignon, was anathema to the pro-papal patricians who had so long ruled the city as if it was their own private preserve. Beginning in the fall of 1346 and ending disastrously in the summer of 1378, these patricians repeatedly worked through the organization of the *Parte Guelfa* to subvert the various popular regimes that held power intermittently. Giovanni Villani contends that the legislation passed in 1346 was expressly designed by the Guelf captains to oust the *novi cives* from the government and to break the hold of the twenty-one guilds over civic affairs. This was to be accomplished by barring *novi cives* from public life who failed to fulfill their communal fiscal obligations or whose ancestors were not native born Florentines.<sup>89</sup> In this way the rule of the "antichi e originali" citizens would be restored and those men of "unknown and insufficient origins" were to be removed from the lists of candidates eligible for communal office when, in the opinion of "true citizens," they were judged to be unworthy of such high honor. Giovanni Villani saw this as the first move in a calculated plot to stifle the political aspirations of the new men. The dénouement soon followed when in January of 1347 the captains of the *Parte Guelfa* initiated even more sweeping legislation to weaken further the power of the newcomers and their political allies and thus put an end, once and for all, to the popular regime. Anyone whose forebears had sympathized with the Ghibellines or who came from territories under Ghibelline domination or who was not reputed to be "a true Guelf and lover of the *Parte* of the Holy Church" was to be declared ineligible for office in the republic.<sup>90</sup> Those who did assume communal posts in

<sup>89</sup> G. Villani, XII, 72; *P.*, 34, f. 93r; *L.F.*, 26, fols. 93r-94r.

<sup>90</sup> G. Villani, XII, 79; *L.F.*, 26, fols. 127-128. This measure barely gained the necessary two-thirds majority required for passage.

violation of this edict were to be fined the exorbitant sum of 500 lire. At first there was extensive public support for this type of legislation, even among the *novi cives* and their friends; apparently, few of these men believed they would be affected by these measures for were they not *amatores* of the *Parte Guelfa*?<sup>91</sup> Did they not stem from the most prosperous rural Florentine families? Had they not despised the pro-imperial Ghibellines and did they not share the prejudices of the aristocracy against foreigners who resided within the city walls?<sup>92</sup> Soon, however, it became evident that the anti-Ghibelline, anti-alien legislation would be used not only against the *novi cives* but also against dissident members of the patriciate, enemies of the captains of the *Parte Guelfa*, supporters of popular government, opponents of the pro-papal foreign policy advocated by the Albizzi and political independents who refused to ally with any faction.

The major chroniclers agreed that the intent of these laws was admirable and even favored amendments to buttress them, but they were deeply disturbed by the partisan and factious spirit in which they were enforced. Accusations of political heterodoxy on grounds of Ghibellinism were soon made against men from all social strata and by 1378 few felt secure. The tense atmosphere of these times encouraged the formulation of a fundamental question which was to have broad implications for subsequent political developments. Who had the authority to decide upon an individual's political orthodoxy and right to membership in the Guelf party? The mediæval commune was composed of a cluster of quasi autonomous bodies and institutions. The *Parte*, the most prominent of these, asserted its authority to select its own members. As with many mediæval legal questions, conflicting precedents could be

<sup>91</sup> The initial measure of January, 1347 had several safeguards that were designed to protect the new "artefici." Cf. G. Villani, XII, 79. The word "artefici" (in Italian) or "artifices" (in Latin) is used to describe men whose occupations range from small-scale producers of goods to the great industrial entrepreneurs. According to Villani, as soon as it became evident that the *Parte* wanted to use this type of legislation to overthrow popular government in Florence, two-thirds of the members of the priorate wished to annul the anti-Ghibelline laws, but the power of the captains was so great that this was impossible. Cf. G. Villani, XII, 92. The new men disfranchised by these laws were Bartolo di Gruerio, Lorenzo Bonacorsi, Gallo di Rossi, recently of Poggibonsi, Iacobo Faloci, also of Poggibonsi, Neruzzio, a hosier and Francesco Guerrio, a carpenter. The only patrician affected was Uberto Infangati, a banker, and he was restored to communal office two years later. In 1360 he was sentenced to death for treason in absentia. Cf. *C.C.*, 20, fols. 20-20r; *C.C.*, 22, f. 61r; *C.C.*, 23, f. 18; *CC.*, 25, fols. 78r-86.

<sup>92</sup> The *novi cives* were never anxious to extend the rights of citizenship. Cf. *P.*, 66, f. 57; *L.F.*, 26, fols. 93-94r.

cited because of the informal and *ad hoc* character of the communal constitution.<sup>93</sup> In 1349 the *Parte's* claim was placed in jeopardy when the Signoria arrogated to itself the right to confer Guelf status upon worthy individuals and groups.<sup>94</sup> During the next few years, the Signoria used this power when it accepted petitions of families who contended they had been excluded from the *Parte* and unjustly accused of being Ghibellines; the Signoria ordered the *Parte* to admit them.<sup>95</sup> The communal councils acquiesced to requests from syndics of rural communes, newly integrated into the Florentine state, that the inhabitants be recognized as "veri et originali guelfi," despite the fact that Ghibellines had previously lived in these areas.<sup>96</sup> In 1354 Florence sent ambassadors to San Gimignano to reorganize the territory; upon their return, the Signoria acted upon the advice of its emissaries and conferred the benefits of citizenship upon the populace. Henceforth, the men of this region were to be known as "guelfi populares, veri, originari et antiqui."<sup>97</sup> The captains of the *Parte* responded to these challenges by raising the matriculation fee so that anyone applying for admission, whose ancestors had not been enrolled, was required to pay 100 florins. Since this sum was equivalent to twenty-five years rent on the average artisan's shop, this measure was designed to be an effective deterrent to all but the most affluent.<sup>98</sup> The Signoria continued to assert its right to receive men into the *Parte Guelfa* and maintained that it alone had authority in these matters. Further, it declared that the captains could not accept members unless prior approval was obtained from the Signoria.<sup>99</sup> There were other issues dividing the *Parte* and the Signoria: the most delicate of these was the question of economic autonomy. In 1351 the communal councils enacted a provision authorizing the Signoria to elect state auditors to review the accounts of the *Parte* reaching back over two decades. This problem had disturbed the rapport between the *Parte* and earlier popular regimes; its persistence emphasized the ambiguous character of communal governments in which the boundary between the authority of quasi independent bodies and the force of public law tended to become a twilight zone. Nowhere

<sup>93</sup> *Diplomatico*, Strozzi (21 November 1311); *Diplomatico*, Spedale degli Innocenti (30 July 1325).

<sup>94</sup> *P.*, 45, fols. 113-114r.

<sup>95</sup> *P.*, 37, f. 23.

<sup>96</sup> *P.*, 39, f. 202.

<sup>97</sup> *C.P.*, 1, 2, f. 5; *P.*, 40, f. 137.

<sup>98</sup> *Parte Guelfa*, numeri rossi, 1, f. 31.

<sup>99</sup> *Statuti del Capitano* (1355), 11, bk. I, rub. 201; *P.*, 37, f. 22r.

was this dilemma better illustrated than in the bitter dispute over the fiscal and juridical autonomy of the *Parte*.<sup>1</sup>

Giano della Bella, the patrician leader of the popular regime of 1293-1295, was among the first to challenge the warrant of the *Parte* to deprive Florentines of their right to hold office on charges of Ghibellinism. Now, during the middle years of the fourteenth century, the controversy still raged around this crucial question. Did the Signoria or the *Parte Guelfa* have ultimate jurisdiction in this matter? The legislative debates of 1354 disclose that Florentines were far from united on this question, with the *novi cives* and their allies favoring the Signoria. In the years immediately following the Black Death, the Ricci clan assumed leadership of the popular party and they continued in this role until the end of the 1360's. During these two decades they tended to support measures advocated by the *novi cives* to reduce the influence of the *Parte Guelfa* over communal politics and favored the supremacy of the Signoria. Uguccione dei Ricci, spokesman for this group, consistently urged the Signoria to assume responsibility for protecting the liberty of the city against the intrigues of those who threatened the independence and sovereignty of the republic.<sup>2</sup> He included among the foes of *libertà*, intransigent feudatories, lawless nobles, avaricious emperors and designing popes. He was a militant partisan of a pragmatic foreign policy, free from commitments to the old Guelf allies — the Holy See and Naples — and a resolute defender of communal sovereignty against the claims of quasi independent institutions. The assumption of this posture placed him in the vanguard of those who opposed the *Parte Guelfa*. Antagonism mounted when he supported an alliance with the Ghibelline Visconti; this enraged the Albizzi leadership of the *Parte*. He then actively encouraged the Florentines to take up arms against neighboring Pisa and continued to exhort the Signoria to press on for total victory over its arch rival. While his exertions were loudly applauded by the *novi cives* and won Uguccione much popularity among the masses, they were scorned by the prominent oligarchs, Piero degli Albizzi and Carlo Strozzi whose desperate attempts to make peace were vigorously backed by the *Parte* and the papacy.<sup>3</sup>

The *novi cives* were anxious to gain representation in all communal bodies and institutions and looked to Uguccione for leadership. In 1358 they won a singular victory when Uguccione successfully led an assault

<sup>1</sup> *P.*, 38, f. 226; *P.*, 39, f. 15r.

<sup>2</sup> *C.P.*, 1, 1, f. 4; *ibid.*, f. 51r; *ibid.*, f. 110.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. footnote 57 above and *C.P.*, 2, f. 119r; *C.P.*, 8, f. 57.

against the preponderance of aristocratic influence in the *Parte Guelfa*; the proportion of representation accorded the nobility in the captaincy was substantially reduced and the number open to the *novi cives* from the major guilds was increased.<sup>4</sup> Eight years later he again took up the cause of the new men and, for the first time in communal history, those from the minor guilds were given two seats in the sacred precincts of the *Parte*. A series of provisions were enacted in the winter of 1366 justifying this radical step; fear was rampant among the citizenry since "even true Guelfs" were being accused of Ghibellinism and driven from public life. By adding new men to the captaincy, the Signoria hoped to preserve "the good and peaceful state of the city," and defend the "*libertà*" of its denizens. Before such accusations could be made in the future, they had to be investigated and verified by five of the seven captains from the guilds. Uguccione and his partisans contended that the *Parte Guelfa* desired to enslave Florence, make the inhabitants her vassals and, thereby, destroy the "*buono stato*" of her artisan and merchant classes. But the presence of the *novi cives* in the supreme magistracy of the *Parte* would prevent this and preserve the *libertà* of the citizenry "especially the artisans and merchants."<sup>5</sup> A new rapport was emerging between the *novi cives* and those elements of the patriciate hostile to the philo-papal, Albizzi-led Guelfs which had the effect of drawing these men together into a *parte popolare*. When the chief Guelfs of the city objected to receiving new men from the minor guilds into their ranks, Uguccione threatened to assemble the merchants, artisans and *il popolo* together in a parliament and this, he insinuated, would be the beginning of revolution in Florence.<sup>6</sup> When the captains of the *Parte Guelfa* were charged with having "defamed and injured the priors," Uguccione was quick to suggest that these evil men be punished for their *superbia* and that representatives from the seven major and fourteen minor guilds be called upon to fix the penalties. At this time, the Ricci and other popular leaders were coming to rely more upon the support of the

<sup>4</sup> *P.*, 45, f. 189.

<sup>5</sup> *P.*, 54, f. 133r; D. Velluti, *La cronica domestica*, op. cit., p. 249. Tommaso di Mone, seller of grain, speaking for the gonfaloniere, contended that the adoption of these measures would unite the city, strengthen the "*populus*" and increase the security "of the middling and minor citizenry" (*mediorum et minorum con civium*). Cf. *C.P.*, 8, f. 1.

<sup>6</sup> The terms used by Uguccione, as reported in the chronicle of Velluti (p. 250), are "*i popolari, artefici*" and "*I popolo di Firenze*." These men were to defend "*il bene comune*" against "*le famiglie popolari grandi*." Cf. also Stefani, rub. 695. Uguccione's brother, Rosso, exhorted the Signoria to elect citizens who were "*amatores statum et communis*" to conserve the *libertà* of Florence. Cf. *C.P.*, 8, f. 23r.



artisans and "middling citizens," *modici cives*, new to the political scene, who were consistently in attendance at the legislative debates.<sup>7</sup> They urged the communal councils to grant these new men a share of the important offices in the *contado* and advised the Signoria to consult with the newcomers on the formulation of foreign policy. The Ricci and their followers counted upon these new men to be a force "for the public good and the conservation and increase of liberty"; in the process, it was hoped that they would bring honor to the merchant class and stymie the tyrannical aspirations of the *Parte Guelfa*.<sup>8</sup>

Out of the struggle against the *Parte* emerges the most renowned of all Trecento Florentine popular leaders. Salvestro de' Medici had consistently been an audacious speaker for political causes that were bound to win him the enthusiastic adherence of the *novi cives* from the greater and lesser guilds. In 1363 he boldly proposed that the revenues from certain properties belonging to the church be assigned to the republic and that the clergy be compelled to make extensive loans to the communal treasury. In the following year, during another session of the councils, he attacked the philo-papal *Parte Guelfa* for its attempt to drive a new citizen from public life for his alleged Ghibelline sympathies; enraged he went on to suggest that the government should conduct an inquiry into this type of nefarious practice and punish the provocateurs. At the moment when Ugucione was bitterly castigating the *Parte*, Salvestro called upon the priors to resist the machinations of the evil *capitani* who were seeking "to gain control of the city of Florence." Like the Ricci leader, he then entered a plea for unity between the merchants and artisans in order that they might "avoid being divided by those who desired to seize power."<sup>9</sup> Along with other popular leaders such as Tommaso Strozzi, Giorgio Scali, Benedetto Alberti and Filippo di Cionetto Bastari, he advocated that the new middling citizens play a more decisive role in communal affairs; particularly, he desired that they be consulted on the conduct of diplomatic relations with the papacy and be included in the captaincy of the *Parte*. There was little doubt that the advice these *novi cives* would offer the Signoria and the Guelf

<sup>7</sup> C.P., 8, f. 57. Rosso also criticised the injustices committed by the captains against the lower orders, and he and his brother, Ugucione, spoke on behalf of legislation favoring the lesser guildsmen. C.P., 7, fols. 25r, 80, 87. The term "*modici cives*" first appears in the *Consulte et Pratiche* when the government was urged to convoke an assembly of these men who are described as "*sapientes, delectores communis*." C.P., 5, fols. 116r-119r. For a similar request by Ugucione, see C.P., 7, f. 18 (27 September 1365).

<sup>8</sup> C.P., 8, fols. 70, 89r; P., 54, f. 86r (12 December 1366).

<sup>9</sup> G. Bruckner, 'The Medici in the Fourteenth Century,' *Speculum*, XXXII (1957), 17-18.

councils would parallel the opinions held by Salvestro and other popular figures: under no circumstances should Florence ally herself with the Holy See, nor should the *Parte* be permitted to continue its reckless proscriptions. These views were anathema to the Albizzi leadership of the Guelfs and the offense was compounded when Salvestro and the new citizens reopened an old wound in the body politic by again championing an alliance with Ghibelline Milan.<sup>10</sup> Suspicion of papal ambitions in Tuscany persisted and further intensified the hostility of popular leadership; now, more than ever, these men were coming to favor an aggressive anti-papal foreign policy. Salvestro's speeches in the council halls indicate he was the most impassioned spokesman in this cause.<sup>11</sup> Throughout Florentine history there had been others who had assumed similar positions but they had uttered their sentiments under very different historical conditions. In the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries, the new men were only perfunctory participants in civic life, however, by the 1360's and 70's, this order provided a substantial political base on which a program could be grounded. Since their entry into Florentine politics in sizable numbers in 1343, the influence of the *novi cives* had been expanding and their political behavior indicated they would make trustworthy confederates in the chronic struggle to preserve *libertà*.

#### PER BENE DI COMUNE: POLITICAL INDEPENDENCE AND NOVI CIVES

In the minds of many Florentines, the Albizzi faction and the *Parte Guelfa* stood condemned as the subversive arm of the Holy See plotting to undermine the republic. Now, at the start of the 1370's, the Ricci chiefs were also accused of harboring the same treasonous designs. According to Stefani, Uguccone was bribed with tempting offers of rich ecclesiastical benefices for his kinsmen to forsake the cause of the *parte popolare* and join the Albizzi to bring Florence into the papal camp.<sup>12</sup> As long as these two great clans opposed one another, the republic and its *libertà* were secure, since each was strong enough to prevent the other from completely dominating the machinery of state. However, once a coalition was formed there would be the problem of checking its power in order to prevent the rise of a pro-papal despotism.

<sup>10</sup> C.P., 12, f. 172r (12 November 1374); f. 160r (31 October 1374).

<sup>11</sup> In 1376 he proposed that the government confiscate all ecclesiastical property if the pope did not meet Florentine demands. He went on to suggest that these lands be sold and that the revenue be employed to wage war against the papacy. Cf. C.P., 14, f. 85.

<sup>12</sup> Rub. 726.

If the republic was to be saved, the *parte popolare* would have to be reconstituted as the one force capable of fighting for "the welfare of the commune" (*il bene di comune*).<sup>13</sup> It would then be necessary for them to restrain the political influence of the great clans and, thereby, preserve the rule of public law, communal jurisdiction, state property and rights, and the impersonal machinery of government. The events of January, 1372 justified the worst fears of Stefani and his public-spirited contemporaries; the Ricci did indeed ally with Carlo Strozzi, Bonaiuto de' Serragli and other prominent members of the revived Albizzi faction. Strozzi saved the then prior, Bartolo di Giovanni Siminetti, from bankruptcy and the latter, in turn, coerced his colleagues into passing a law raising the *Parte Guelfa* authority to unprecedented heights. Michele di Vanni di ser Lotto, who had labored long and hard with Piero degli Albizzi to ally Florence with the Holy See, was also instrumental in forcing through this legislation.<sup>14</sup> The *Parte* was granted autonomous status and freed from all governmental checks; no measure could be enacted against this organization without obtaining its prior consent. The laconic Stefani bitterly observed that the merchants and artisans of the city were now indeed the slaves of the tyrannical Albizzi-Ricci faction. His pessimistic sentiments were echoed by the counselors to the Signoria, and when in April of the same year a new priorate entered office, it sought to undo the work of the factious leadership of the *Parte Guelfa*.<sup>15</sup> Sitting in the Signoria were four *novi cives* and four non-faction men; only the *gonfaloniere* of justice was a follower of the Albizzi. It was this combination of new men and political independents, backed by Salvestro de' Medici, Giovanni Magalotti, Giovanni di Luigi de' Mozzi, Luigi di Lippo, Aldobrandini and other popular leaders who now advanced a far-reaching program for the conservation of the republic's *libertà* against their adversaries.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.* For a discussion of the tendency to use the phrases "pro bono communis" and "pro communi bono" interchangeably, see N. Rubinstein, 'Political Ideas in Sienese Art,' *op. cit.*, 184-185; L. Minio-Paluello, 'Remigio de' Girolami's *De bonocommuni*,' *Italian Studies*, XI (1956), 56-59.

<sup>14</sup> D. Velluti, *La cronica domestica*, *op. cit.*, p. 253; Stefani, rub. 730.

<sup>15</sup> The description of the events offered by Stefani in rub. 731 of his chronicle is substantiated by the records found in volume 12 of the *Consulte et Pratiche*. See especially folio 10 which contains a report of the speech made by Filippo Bastari Cionetto before the Signoria, calling upon the citizens to defend the "statum popularis" against the Ricci and Albizzi. The same judgment is expressed by Giovanni di Pagolo Morelli in his *Ricordi*, ed. V. Branca (Florence, 1956), p. 25, when he condemns the Ricci and Albizzi for not allowing the "artefici" and the men "di piccolo affare" to live in peace.

The fundamental legislation enacted by this most democratic of all Florentine regimes was initiated by the *artifices* and *populares* of the republic. The composition of the government from April of 1372 to July of 1375 indicates that the *artifices* were the *novi cives* and the *populares* were the non-factionous independents who now resolutely battled *per il bene di comune*. In the documents of the period, this coalition referred to themselves as "artifices and populares" who were "zelatores of the popular status of the city."<sup>16</sup> The term "popular status of the city" implied the existence of a political atmosphere free from the inordinate influence of the *Parte Guelfa* and the factions. It also connoted a respect for statutory law and the verdicts of the communal courts. It postulated the impartial assessment and collection of taxes, the curtailment of ecclesiastical immunity and privilege, and equality before the communal magistracies. Peculations of public funds, revenue delinquencies and crimes by the powerful against the poor and the weak were not to be tolerated. To this end the magistrates were enjoined to obey the letter of the law and not to be swayed by personal considerations. Extensive syndication of all state functionaries became the order of the day. Special officials and new rectors were to be chosen by the Signoria to buttress public authority in Florentine territories. Other officers with extra-ordinary powers to enforce governmental edicts were to be elected.<sup>17</sup> The collection of direct taxes was to be regularized and important reforms were to be made in the Florentine treasury. Communal accountants were selected to protect the estates of minors and to recover properties that had been usurped. Finally, the intractable, lawless elements among the patriciate were to be driven out of political life so that the artisans and *populares* might live and work in peace.<sup>18</sup>

The regime of 1372 also proclaimed itself the defender of Florence's most treasured possession — its *libertà*, "whose price no one could estimate."<sup>19</sup> In order to preserve this precious inheritance, it would be necessary to eradicate all factions and divisions within the city. To this end, the Signoria acted favorably on a petition presented by the "artisans and populares" barring leading members of the Ricci and Albizzi houses from public life for a protracted interval. Shortly thereafter, the scope of this law was extended and harsher terms were

<sup>16</sup> C.P., 12, f. 13.

<sup>17</sup> C.P., 12, f. 55r. These men were to preserve the city "in sua libertate." Cf. C.P., 12, fols. 14, 36r.

<sup>18</sup> F. Perrens, *op. cit.*, vol. IV, p. 523; *Diario di anonimo fiorentino*, ed. A. Gherardi (Florence, 1867), p. 494; *Capitoli*, XI, fols. 72, 76, 80.

<sup>19</sup> P., 60, f. 2r.

laid down — again at the behest of the artisans and *populares*.<sup>20</sup> At the same time as the Signoria limited the authority of the great families, it acted to enhance the political prestige of the new men from the lesser guilds in a most dramatic way. In April of 1372, *minori* were admitted into the august council of the High Court of the Merchants, *Mercanzia*, for the first time in communal history. Even the relatively democratic Stefani was shocked when the Signoria accepted the petition requesting the elevation of parvenus into the hallowed precincts of this magistracy and he commented bitterly that the artisans had gained much in past years as a result of the conflict between the Ricci and Albizzi, but now with the founding of the new Signoria, they were entering those halls where only “the most solemn, most experienced, and most wise merchants of Florence” ought by right to sit.<sup>21</sup> Lapo da Castiglionchio, principal publicist for the aristocratic ethos of the *Parte Guelfa* and the most famous hater of popular government in Florence at this time, bemoaned the many rewards and honors bestowed upon these unworthy upstarts, and later blamed these presumptuous men for the many ills that befell the commune. The laments of Lapo were uttered in the palace of the Guelf party and in letters to his son, but as a member of the *balia* and counselor to the Signoria he did not oppose the admission of the *novi cives* into the *Mercanzia*, rather, he piously orated that the government should do what was useful for the commune and the guilds.<sup>22</sup> The records of the debates of the councils from 1372 to 1375 indicate that there were other speakers with the same commitments as Lapo who were reluctant to talk against the new men. There was also a misleading unanimity among the speakers on the feasibility of establishing an extra-ordinary commission to repress the overweening power, *maioritates*, of the great families.<sup>23</sup> Even though the Ricci and Albizzi formally agreed to abide by this proposal, they did not abandon their old political grudges and their consuming ambitions. Deprived of the authority

<sup>20</sup> P., 60, f. 157. Under no circumstances was this provision to be suspended.

<sup>21</sup> Rub. 734. See D. Velluti (p. 241) for a description of the effect that factionalism had upon the new men from the lesser guilds. On the seating of these men in the *Mercanzia*, see G. Bonolis, *La giurisdizione della Mercanzia in Firenze nel secolo XIV* (Florence, 1901), p. 82. The petition that initiated this legislation was presented by the “artifices” of Florence. Cf. C.P., 12, f. 20 (21 April 1372).

<sup>22</sup> C.P., 12, f. 20. For the private opinions of Lapo on this question, see L. Mehus, *Epistola o sia ragionamento di messer Lapo da Castiglionchio* (Bologna, 1753), p. 162. For a description of his political outlook, see P. J. Jones, ‘Florentine Families and Florentine Diaries in the Fourteenth Century,’ *Papers of the British School at Rome*, XXIV (1956), 191-192.

<sup>23</sup> C.P., 14, f. 14. Only Uguccone dei Ricci spoke out against this proposal, complaining that it was an illegal measure taken at the behest of private citizens who acted without communal authorization.

of public office, they turned away from the Signoria and embraced the *Parte Guelfa* as the most effective means for realizing their aspirations.

The *novi cives* and their confederates were now firmly entrenched in public life and were to continue to dominate the Signoria until 1382. Not satisfied with having reduced the influence of the Albizzi and Ricci over communal affairs, these men now sought for a broader distribution of public offices. The officials elected to investigate usurpations of the commune's rights and properties by the great families, soon learned that these selfsame Florentines were also guilty of violating the *divieto*. This ancient legislation prohibited members of the same family from holding high office simultaneously and fixed an interval during which an individual was declared ineligible for re-election; it also prevented the nobility from occupying certain key posts. These enactments gave an impersonal tone to the conduct of civic affairs, since they restricted the power of the large old families and encouraged the political mobility of the *novi cives*. In the judgment of Matteo Villani, it was the *divieto*, more than any other single type of legislation, that was responsible for the rise of the new men.<sup>24</sup> The lists of candidates for office inscribed in the *Tratte* reveal that during the decade of the seventies, large numbers of patricians were barred from office because of the effectiveness of the *divieto*. If one member of the Strozzi family sat in the priorate, then fifty of his kinsmen might be denied entry. But like so many other statutes, the *divieto* was frequently observed in the breach.<sup>25</sup> Records of the legislative debates before 1372 suggest that the enforcement of the *divieto* was closely tied to other political considerations. The *Parte Guelfa* repeatedly used the tactic of pressing for anti-Ghibelline legislation in order to force the Signoria to accept a relaxation of the *divieto* against the patriciate and the opening of certain offices to them. This curious connection between legislation on the *divieto* and measures against Ghibellines served to further tangle the already complex web of communal politics. When the *Parte* threatened to enforce rigorously the provisions against Ghibellines, the Signoria would propose that the communal councils agree to a redistribution of offices so that the patriciate might be better represented. Upon

<sup>24</sup> M. Villani, VIII, 31.

<sup>25</sup> E. Sestan, 'Il comune nel trecento,' in *Libera Cattedra di Storia della Civiltà Fiorentina: Il Trecento* (Florence, 1953), p. 27. For charges against two members of the Albizzi family accused of violating the *divieto*, see Stefani, rub. 739. The chronicler was one of four communal officials who investigated this matter and he was convinced of their guilt. Documents in the *Sindacato del Podesta*, 20, fols. 43-45 substantiate this. A summary of these materials can be found in G. Masi's, *Il sindacato delle magistrature comunali nei secoli XIV* (Rome, 1930), p. 112.

occasion the *novi cives* would dissent, and since a two-thirds majority was necessary for the passage of legislation, the ameliorative efforts of the Signoria would be frustrated. It was the presence of the new men in government that reduced the number of posts open to the older families. In the 1350's, Donato Velluti justified his support of anti-Ghibelline legislation on the grounds that only one of his relations had been declared eligible for office over a four year period. In his estimation, the term « Ghibelline » was synonymous with the phrase *novi cives* and it was these pushy upstarts who were responsible for his family's dilemma.<sup>26</sup> During subsequent decades the more factious leaders who dominated the *Parte Guelfa* saw the new men as being wholly contaminated with the virus of Ghibellinism. Opposition of the *novi cives* to the Albizzi-sponsored papal alliance intensified this animosity, and in the 1370's the *Parte* struck venomously at this group when it ostracized the most prominent of their number on the spurious charge of Ghibellinism.<sup>27</sup> The popular party, led by the Ricci during the fifties and sixties, tended to be just as obdurate in their support of the *divieto* and in their hostility to pro-papal alliances and anti-Ghibelline legislation. But in 1372 when the Ricci deserted their old political allies and joined the camp of the Albizzi they reversed roles and became ardent proponents of political proscription and extreme partisans of the philo-papal policies of the *Parte Guelfa*. The new men, better represented in the Signoria than at any time since 1347, turned their energies towards conserving popular government. The *Parte Guelfa* had conducted, in past times, campaigns of vilification and abuse which contributed greatly to the decline of earlier popular regimes. Now, the new men of 1372, much more experienced in the tactics of political warfare, adroitly sought to contain the *Parte* and to eradicate factionalism. Formerly, they had attempted to achieve these ends by allying with the Ricci, now they hoped to accomplish them through increasing the impersonal force of government by undermining the political influence of the great families in command of the *Parte Guelfa*.

<sup>26</sup> D. Velluti, *La cronica domestica*, op. cit., p. 241. Even those Florentines most hostile to the new men agreed that there were no bonafide Ghibellines in Florence at this time. Cf. 'Discorso d'autore incerto (1377),' in G. Capponi, *Storia della repubblica di Firenze* (Florence, 1930), vol. I, p. 593. "...e veramente ognuno era diventato guelfo d' animo, di volere e di ogni suo pensiero. Poteasi dire che a Firenze non fusse alcuno ghibellino che non fussi antichi nobili rubelli: ma della gente comune mezzana e minore di che nazione si fusse tutti di volontà erano guelfi."

<sup>27</sup> Among those accused were Ugolino di Bonsi, seller of spices, Manente d'Amedeo and Valeriano Dolicibene, vintners, Giraldo di Paolo Giraldi, tanner, and numerous others referred to in the judicial records. Cf. especially, *Atti Esecutore*, vols. 785, 790.

The *divieto* was indeed a powerful weapon in their hands and by coupling it with the ingenious technique of conferring noble status upon their political adversaries, the *novi cives* could look forward to disfranchising the more hostile elements of the city.

The partisans of the Albizzi-Ricci coalition numbered approximately one-sixth of the total of those Florentines eligible for communal office. The personal and intimate character of urban life made it difficult for men to camouflage their loyalties and political affiliations, therefore, it was easy for the *novi cives* to seek out their enemies. The ouster of the Albizzi and Ricci from the Signoria was the first step and was followed by repeated attacks against their adherents. These faction men were seen as opponents of the government — revolutionaries, if you will — whose leaders had been barred from public office and whose only remaining political bastion was the *Parte Guelfa*, and even this encampment was becoming insecure. The Florentine state was drifting towards war with the papacy and by 1375 the philo-papal sympathies of the *Parte* bordered on treason. The *Parte* stood against the powerful tide towards war that was coming to be popularly regarded as a crusade in defense of Florence's sacred liberty. When the Albizzi and their followers, from the vantage point of the *Parte*, hurled charges of Ghibellinism against the *novi cives* directing this war for the preservation of the republic, they were placed in the position of seeking to crucify men regarded by the masses as secular saints. *Novi cives* such as Giovanni Dini and Guccio di Dino Gucci were, in fact, numbered among the "Eight Saints" who demonstrated that they preferred the safety of their country to the salvation of their own souls when they undertook the leadership of the government in war. For their heroic efforts both suffered excommunication at the hands of the church and abuse from the *Parte*. In July of 1378, however, knightly status was bestowed upon these two patriots by a grateful *popolo*. Other new men were also to be dishonored by the papacy and the *Parte* only to receive accolades at the hands of the people. Events from 1372 to 1378 tended to make heroes of new men like Tommaso di Mone, also one of the Eight Saints, Niccolo Lapozzi, an official chosen to defend the *libertà* of the city, and Recco Guazza, proponent of the confiscation of ecclesiastical properties. All of these men were excommunicated by the church and attacked by the *Parte*. Andrea di Feo, a paving contractor, Maso di Nero, a rope maker, Francesco di Geri, an ironmonger, and many others held important offices at this time and suffered assaults from the *Parte*.<sup>28</sup> It was the new men who were the patriots and unequivocal champions of the

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*, 800, f. 4r.



Florentine republic, while the Guelf patriciate were seen as the enemies of the government and perpetrators of sedition.

The overwhelming majority of Florentines eligible for high office during the middle years of the *Trecento*, were neither extreme Guelf partisans nor committed members of factions; rather, they were political moderates who counseled caution and compromise in most things. Despite their capacity to temporize on a variety of issues, they remained firm in their patriotic commitments to the defense of *libertà* and republican government. They understood well the pragmatic character of Florentine politics and recognized that on the day to day level there must be compromise in order to insure the survival of the republic. This conciliatory attitude extended even to the burning questions of the *divieto* and the enforcement of anti-Ghibelline legislation. During the fifties and sixties, these moderates favored the relaxation of the *divieto* and opposed the extensive use of political proscription. They hoped to reconcile the great families to the existing constitutional order by easing the stipulations of the *divieto* and, thereby, convince them it was unnecessary to denounce the *novi cives* as political subversives in order to gain a larger share of communal offices. At the same time they sought to placate the *novi cives* by reducing the threat of political proscription, while upholding the principle of the *divieto*. The moderates suggested that the law be suspended for short periods of time, and then only as a temporary measure.<sup>29</sup> The chronicle of Donato Velluti serves to clarify the political dilemma of men of moderate stripe: they were most anxious to remain in the good graces of the *Parte* and yet avoid antagonizing the *novi cives*. Velluti, who wrote about the adverse effect of the *divieto* upon the political ambitions of his own large family, rose in the council halls to exhort the Signoria to mitigate its most drastic features. In the same speech he urged that the priors meet with the captains of the *Parte* and reform the anti-Ghibelline legislation. This he did in the company of other Florentine moderates such as Stefano del Forese, Giovanni Lanfredini and the ubiquitous Giovanni Geri del Bello.<sup>30</sup> These middle-of-the-roaders won their point in 1354 and the captains ceased proscribing Florentine citizens until 1358. In January of that year, new and more terrible procedures were introduced by these captains who, in the opinion of Matteo Villani, desired to intimidate the Signoria and establish themselves as "little tyrants" over the city.<sup>31</sup> The extreme Guelfs who successfully advocated this reign of terror were overtly pro-

<sup>29</sup> C.P., I, 2, f. 72.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, fols. 72-73.

<sup>31</sup> M. Villani, VIII, 31.

papal and employed the new techniques of political persecution to force through an alliance with the papal legate in 1359. Despite the efforts of the moderates, the attacks were intensified and in April, 1363, Matteo Villani himself fell victim to the intrigues of the captains on the tired charge of Ghibellinism.<sup>32</sup> His proscription and subsequent dismissal from office revealed the vulnerability of the non-faction men who counseled moderation and stood as political independents. The partisans and allies of the great clans were either represented in the *Parte* or had a voice in the powerful political cliques of the city; in this way they were able to achieve a modicum of security. Now the threat of disfranchisement encompassed the independents as well as the *novi cives*. As much as any other factor, this common insecurity welded these two groups together and induced them to unite against their mutual adversaries.

Few Florentines were optimistic about the outcome of what was now frankly spoken of as "la guerra cittadinesca" raging between the faction men and their opponents. The political confidence of the moderates was giving way to a pervasive sense of despair. Even the most sanguine of Florentine chroniclers, Velluti, could only hope that Divine Providence would end this "citizen war" before it brought his beloved city to ruin, but he seriously doubted that his prayers would be answered.<sup>33</sup> Matteo Villani's history concludes as a diatribe against those men of "pessima e iniqua condizione" who imposed capricious tests of political orthodoxy upon virtuous citizens. Even more vitriolic was his polemic against those captains of the *Parte* who were willing to betray Florence's sacred liberty in exchange for high ecclesiastical office.<sup>34</sup> But the independents sitting in the communal councils, at this time, were not content to murmur prayers or launch invectives. Rather, they were intent upon finding positive remedies for this intolerable situation. No longer did they offer the soothing balm of compromise to the great oligarchs, for it was now evident that the Albizzi and the *Parte* would not be easily reconciled to the existing constitutional order. Stefani maintained that the citizens felt that they were now at the mercy of the evil Guelf captains.<sup>35</sup> In January of 1364, Giovanni Gerri del Bello, advisor to the Signoria, charged that the captains were unjustly defaming "good citizens" who were known to be ardent supporters of

<sup>32</sup> G. Brucker, 'The Ghibelline Trial of Matteo Villani (1362),' *op. cit.*, 49-50.

<sup>33</sup> D. Velluti, *La cronica domestica*, *op. cit.*, p. 241; G. Capponi, *op. cit.*, p. 593.

<sup>34</sup> G. Brucker, *op. cit.*, 53-55.

<sup>35</sup> Stefani, rub. 674. Stefani's contention is supported by the fact that large numbers of prominent citizens were being persecuted by the *Parte*. Cf. rub. 743; *Atti del Esecutore*, vols. 752, 790.

Guelfic principles. He then called upon the priorate to act as the "avior", *salutificator*, of the beleaguered citizenry. Others speaking on this question who were to become prominent in the government after 1372 as political independents were Barna di Valorino Curiani, Niccolo Alberti, Bernardo Bigliotti, and the candid, Salvestro de' Medici; they too recognized that the Signoria must stand as a buffer against the tyrannous aspirations of those who sought to overthrow the popular and free status of the city.<sup>36</sup>

Many of the men the *Parte* denounced as Ghibellines were notaries who held a variety of administrative positions in the city and countryside. As early as February of 1347, less than a month after the enactment of the initial laws against the Ghibellines, when the first proscriptions took place, a number of these office holders were charged with political heterodoxy.<sup>37</sup> These notaries constituted the hard core of the Florentine bureaucracy and without their continued participation in civil life, it would have been difficult to carry on the daily business of government. The notary performed those routine political tasks which most directly impinged upon the daily life of the citizenry ranging from the enforcement of verdicts of the courts to the maintenance of walls, bridges and roads. It was these men who conducted investigations of such sensitive questions as the speculation of communal funds and the usurpation of state property. They also handled the payment of mercenaries, the collection of many different, but equally unpopular, communal levies and acted as conservers of the republic's rights. In the course of these manifold activities they were subject to a plethora of pressures from those desiring a reduction in their tax assessment, a lowering of their *gabelle*, certification of payments alleged to have been made on behalf of the commune, title to disputed property, the squelching of investigations and favorable action in the matter of the exercise of extra-legal authority by the great patricians of the city and *contado*. If these lesser office holders could resist the threats and blandishments of the overmighty, then impersonal government would indeed have some opportunity to survive in Florence. In enforcing the verdicts of the courts and carrying out the letter of the law, these notaries risked incurring the enmity of powerfully entrenched interests and even the disfavor of their own fellow citizens. Their problems were compounded since they were, for the most part, *novi cives* of modest origins and, therefore, contemptible to those whose *dignitas* and pride

<sup>36</sup> C.P., 5, f. 7. Benedetto di Geri del Bello, Giovanni's brother, was proscribed by the *Parte* in 1377. Cf. Stefani, 770.

<sup>37</sup> *Atti del Esecutore*, 79, fols. 7-7r.

of blood set them above the rule of communal law. It can be suggested that the antipathy felt by the potentates towards the state functionaries was directly proportional to the office holder's lack of status and to the frequency with which the exercise of his duties interfered with the interests of the aforesaid patricians.

That the lesser men of state came under the concerted attack of the dynasts implies that the political importance of minor posts frequently was not commensurate with the humble title used to designate the routine character of their function. These men were pickets stationed on the boundary line that separated public law from private rights. The Signoria could ill-afford to regard these political careerists, bureaucrats and civil servants as pawns to be sacrificed in artfully waged civic games without suffering a considerable attrition of its own authority. Matteo Villani held the controversial post of official over the funded communal debt when he fell victim to the machinations of the *Parte*. Other officers of the Florentine treasury to suffer an identical fate were Giovanni Parenti and Michele di Puccio.<sup>38</sup> Communal officials over the grain supply, the shops of the *Platea*, those in charge of the assets of bankrupts, syndics over judicial officers, reviewers of the accounts of the republic, rectors over communal property, those empowered to enforce the city's sumptuary laws, tax collectors and a host of other civil servants who served in numerous key positions throughout the Tuscan countryside were all casualties of the bitter political vendetta being waged by the *Parte Guelfa* against Florentine officialdom.

In 1366 the *Parte* struck at the most prominent of the republic's bureaucratic luminaries when it ostracized Niccolò di ser Ventura Monachi, the chancellor of the commune, on the shopworn charge of Ghibellinism. This time the Signoria rose up and defended Monachi with a will. The sentence of the *Parte* was cancelled by action of the priorate and the communal councils. Because of his laudable character, his sincere faith, his great prudence and his faithful labors on behalf of the republic, the chancellor was restored to the full honors of his office and his rightful place among the Guelf hosts of Italy.<sup>39</sup> Unfortunately for Monachi, however, the case was far from closed and

<sup>38</sup> *Estimo*, 307, f. 1; *P.*, 36, f. 69. Another leading Florentine bureaucrat, Donato del Ricco, a lawyer, was also struck down by the *Parte*. In 1366 he spoke in favor of adding two minor guildsmen to the Guelf captaincy. Three years later he opposed sending a subsidy to the Holy See and in the following decade he counseled that Florence make war "viriliter" against the church, and under no circumstances should the commune settle for anything less than complete victory. Cf. *P.*, 54, fols. 81-83; *C.P.*, 10, fols. 107, 129r; *C.P.*, 14, fols. 78r, 86; Stefani, rub. 775.

<sup>39</sup> D. Marzi, *op. cit.*, pp. 99-101.

during the following decade, the political persecution of this leading civil servant was resumed. His tribulations bring to light the complex interplay of personal motives lurking behind the attacks on Florentine bureaucrats. Monachi had incurred the hatred of Bonaiuto di ser Belcavo of the patrician house of Serragli for being the instigator of an accusation brought against the latter in the Court of the Executor. In the charge the allegation was made that when Bonaiuto had been prior in 1372, he exerted pressure upon the government to grant a certain rural commune, in which he had an interest, a substantial reduction in its tax assessment. The unnamed men who presented this indictment, presumably inspired by Monachi, are referred to in the copy of the charges as peaceful merchants, artisans and guildsmen — good citizens all. It was their contention that Bonaiuto had accepted a bribe and acted to defraud the republic of its rightful revenues.<sup>40</sup> There were great outcries of popular discontent when the magistrate failed to convict Bonaiuto on this count, so convinced of his guilt were the Florentines. Three years later, Bonaiuto was chosen chief of the priorate by the Florentine system of lots and he was now in a position to be revenged. Monachi was deposed from the office of chancellor and in 1378 this "truthful, loyal man," outspoken foe of that sect of "criminous men" who loved to proscribe "against every dictate of reason," was finally branded a Ghibelline.<sup>41</sup>

The figure behind Monachi's disfranchisement in 1378 was Lapo da Castiglionchio, the most vigorous and most despised of all proponents of Guelf orthodoxy. Married into the highest echelons of the Florentine aristocracy, Bardi, Cerchi, Amieri, Cavalcanti and all, claiming direct descent from the most ancient of the Tuscan feudatories, loathing trade and tradesmen, this grandee prized "the lordly life," *la vita signorile*, which prevailed in those happy days when his patrician forebears ruled Florence. Commerce was degrading, true grandeur was possible only to those who never stooped to the vile *arti* or *mercanzia*, but conducted themselves like the nobility of old, preferring country life, estate management and the chase to the meaner pursuits of the city. For the most part, urban life is without honor and never bestows "great fame" on those families who desert their ancestral heritage. Lapo's model Florentine family was the Ricasoli who, like the Castiglionchi, were "noble, venerable and great men," contemptuous of the new

<sup>40</sup> *Atti del Esecutore*, 675, f. 32; Stefani, rub. 749; *Parte Guelfa*, numeri rossi, 5, f. 49.

<sup>41</sup> Stefani, rub. 735. Monachi's own guild, the judges and notaries, conducted an investigation into his proscription and stated that it was clearly illegal. Cf. D. Marzi, *op. cit.*, pp. 101-102.

vulgar pursuits and who held tenaciously to the old ways, maintaining themselves in "grandeur" in the countryside. Indeed, it was true that in recent times some of the Ricasoli had become merchants, but they had only trafficked in the noble wool trade with foreign lands and not in "base merchandise." Unlike the *nouveau riche*, the Ricasoli, Bardi and Peruzzi were merchant pilgrims engaged in the virtuous business of the *arte della Lana* and not in petty affairs or usurious transactions.<sup>42</sup>

Lapo's zeal for the traditional was matched only by his contempt for the new order and its principal harbingers, the *novi cives*. Had not some of these upstarts been vassals of the Castiglionchio family who had gone to the city, made their fortunes in base trades and then acquired the precious right of citizenship? Now these new men of *piccolo affari* sat in the communal councils and were too presumptuous to heed the wise advice of their betters. Lapo bemoaned the fact that these parvenus had become so powerful a force in Florentine politics by 1373 that it had become necessary to grant them very important concessions. He wondered whether it was ever truly possible to dissolve the bonds of fealty. Are not these new men indeed still vassals in the sight of God, for did not their ancestors take an oath which bound them to their lord in perpetuity? But nowadays the new men have forgotten their ancient ties and no longer have "the old love" for patrician families such as the Ricasoli, Serragli and Castiglionchi. The same men who lack respect for the prerogatives of the patriciate are also without reverence for Holy Church and are, therefore, to be numbered among her Ghibelline foes who richly deserve the political fate which the *Parte* has in store for them.

Lapo, eminent canon lawyer and lecturer on the Decretals, his brother, Alberto, captain of the *Parte Guelfa* in 1366 when the first attempt was made to proscribe Monachi, and his nephew, Simone di Francesco da Castiglionchio, who denounced Matteo Villani as a Ghibelline, were among the most rabid partisans of Guelf political orthodoxy.<sup>43</sup> The

<sup>42</sup> L. Mehus, *op. cit.*, pp. 43-45, 147-148; P. Jones, *op. cit.*, pp. 191-192.

<sup>43</sup> D. Marzi, *op. cit.*, p. 100; G. Brucker, *op. cit.*, 50-51. Tribaldo da Castiglionchio was also high in the councils of the *Parte* and in 1354 he spoke for the enactment of anti-Ghibelline legislation before representatives of the commune. Cf. *P.*, 41, f. 63. The case of Alberto suggests that holding high office in the *Parte* was not without its advantages. He was convicted by the communal courts for peculation of state funds when serving as a *castellano* in the Florentine *contado*. He petitioned the Signoria for judicial dispensation and it was granted. Cf. *P.*, 42, 133r (9 October 1355). Lapo himself was accused of using a public trust—in this instance, his position as Florentine ambassador to the papal court—to advance the interests of his own family. Specifically, the charge involved his willingness to compromise his city in return for benefices to be conferred upon his nephew, Simone di Francesco. Cf. *Atti del Esecutore*, 510, fols. 29-30r (29 June 1367). Despite the concreteness of the allegations, Lapo was exonerated on all counts. In 1377 he was made a *savio* of the *Parte* for life. Cf. Stefani, rub. 775.

traditional meaning of Ghibellinism, with its emphasis upon strict loyalty to the imperial cause, was alien to Lapo and his generation, for was not the papacy itself looking for an alliance with the emperor which would help to restore the Holy See to Rome? By their definition, Ghibellines did not revere the patriciate, were in sympathy with the *novi cives* and were without devotion to Holy Mother Church. To Lapo and his cohorts, the government that waged war against the papacy from 1375 to 1378 had departed so far from these Guelf principles that it deserved to be stigmatized as Ghibelline.<sup>44</sup>

Prior to 1375, the attacks of the *Parte* were sporadic rather than sustained, but after the outbreak of the war against the papacy, they were intensified until they became an all-out assault directed against the state itself. At a time when the Signoria was telling the populace that Florence was engaged in a struggle to preserve her liberty against the onslaughts of her mortal enemies, the rapacious papal lieutenants, Lapo was contending that the republic had embarked on an evil venture against an invincible enemy which was certain to end disastrously unless the Florentines sued for peace.<sup>45</sup> In the language of Virgil, whom he so much admired, Lapo "had hardened his heart to the

<sup>44</sup> Lapo writes in a bizarre manner of the origin of the names "Ghibelline" and "Guelf." The former stems from "gerentes bellum" against the Holy See, while the latter is derived from "gerentes fidem" to the church. Cf. R. Davidsohn, 'Tre orazioni di Lapo da Castiglionchio,' *Archivio Storico Italiano*, XX (1897), 225-246; L. Mehus, *op. cit.*, p. 78. Lapo consistently favored very close ties with the church. In 1367, when an alliance with Milan—the foremost papal antagonist at this time—was being hotly debated in the government, Lapo argued that the priors "in no way ought to remove Florence's obedience and devotion from the Roman church." If the papacy desires an alliance against Milan, Florence should not decline, for disobedience to the will of the pope is dangerous to the well-being of Guelf cities. Cf. *C.P.*, 9, f. 22r. The following year he counseled that it would not "be useful to make an alliance with Bernabo (Visconti) *qui natura repugnat guelfum ghibellino inimico (sic)*." He went on to advise the Signoria not to ally with the Holy Roman Emperor or vote him a subsidy until His Majesty promised to do the will of the church. Needless to say, Salvestro de' Medici and leading new men such as Tellino Dini, ironmonger, Ricco Taldi, coopersmith, and Schiatta di Rocco, pork butcher, were not in agreement with the opinions of the doctrinaire Guelf. Cf. *C.P.*, 10, f. 38r; *C.P.*, 9, f. 22r.

<sup>45</sup> He went on to state that even though the forces of the church might be driven out of Italy, the Holy See would remain there "in facto et jure. Et ideo pax sine intermissione procuretur." Cf. *C.P.*, f. 65 (26 December 1377). The speaker for the *gonfaloniere* expressed an antithetical view when he called the papal vicars "vulpini". Another spokesman from the same college castigated the iniquitous Tuscan prelates and called them "rebelles" and "hostes" of the commune. Cf. *C.P.*, 15, f. 29 (14 August 1377); f. 47 (17 October 1377). The entry for May 11, 1376 in the *Diario di anonimo fiorentino*, *op. cit.*, p. 308 calls the Florentines "veri cristiani eletti da Dio" to contest the authority of the papacy. It is well to remember that the anti-papal teachings of the Fraticelli were intense at this time. Cf. M. Becker, 'Florentine Politics and the Diffusion of Heresy in the Trecento,' *op. cit.*, 71-73.

internecine strife" and was willing to use the power of the *Parte* to drive those political independents and *novi cives* who were enemies of Mother Church from the government so that this unholy war might be terminated. But the Signoria was not content to sit idly by and turn the other cheek while its membership was suffering political proscription. The government countered with the most refined and artful techniques of political character assassination calculated to discredit Lapo and his ilk. The Ricasoli and Serragli were charged with being "ferocious and lawless nobles" and finally, the ultimate weapon was used when they, along with the Castiglioni, were accused of being Ghibellines.<sup>46</sup> So successful was this campaign of vilification that in June of 1378, when the populace rioted, it was against these obstreperous aristocrats that it moved with torch and ban of exile.

The hero of this coup was Salvestro de' Medici who now acted *pro parte popularium mercatorum et artificum* to protect "the merchants and artisans, the poor and the weak," and all those who desired to live in peace, free from the menace of the fierce nobility. The *Parte* was accused of promoting dangerous innovations and fomenting violence which had swept the city to the brink of revolution. Through its flagrant and unscrupulous use of proscription, the *Parte* had caused "scandala" and instigated a reign of terror among the citizenry. Therefore, in order to restore the city to that free and peaceful condition so necessary for the well-being of the artisans and merchants, the *Parte* was to be stripped of its authority, and the contentious nobility were to be vigorously persecuted. To this end, legislation sponsored by Salvestro was promptly enacted and a special commission was established to rule over the city. Two-thirds of the membership of this *balia* were *novi cives* and they were enjoined to remove the yolk of the *Parte* from the shoulders of the citizenry. One of their first measures was to declare Lapo a rebel and to deprive his clique of their political rights.<sup>47</sup>

The new men and the political independents had achieved a *concordia ordinum* which enabled them to strengthen the machinery of state. Brought together by the fiery hostility of the factions and the animus of the *Parte Guelfa*, personal antagonisms, suspicions and social prejudices tended to erode. Now these two groups cooperated in advancing a program which exalted the authority of the Signoria to unprecedented heights. More intensively than ever, they employed the power of the

<sup>46</sup> *Atti del Esecutore*, vols. 752-806. In Salutati's opinion, Lapo would have done well to remain a man of letters. Cited by P. Jones, *op. cit.*, p. 192.

<sup>47</sup> C. Falletti-Fossati, *Il tumulto dei ciompi* (Siena, 1882), p. 328. Lapo's home was one of the first to be burned and three years later he died in exile.



state to reduce the influence of the great families over the Florentine church contending that these patricians were using the ecclesiastical courts to exploit "artisans and populares." Then they proceeded to attack clerical tribunals which, in their opinion, had been responsible for much injustice and oppression; a provision was enacted permitting any citizen to appeal from a verdict of these courts to the Signoria. The government also sought to render ineffectual the authority of the inquisition in territories under Florentine jurisdiction. State officials replaced clergy, in certain instances, as executors of last wills and testaments. Ecclesiastical tax immunities were revoked; clergy were compelled to pay heavy imposts, and numerous church properties were confiscated by the state to be sold or rented to the Florentines. The Signoria treated the problems of usury, the licensing of pawnbrokers and the taking of interest as matters to be dealt with by public law, without any concern for traditional ecclesiastical prerogatives. Never before had the *divieto* been used with such telling effect to preserve the authority of the state against the might of the old families. A protracted campaign was conducted by the Signoria to rectify certain economic abuses prevalent in civic life so that communal rights would prevail over private interests.<sup>48</sup>

By 1378 this *consensus omnium bonorum* had not only resulted in the strengthening of the government as a buffer against the aggressive aristocracy, but it had also altered markedly the status of the new men. They were now in a position where they could justly claim citizenship, not merely because they had satisfied legal technicalities or economic requirements, but rather on the grounds that they had fulfilled the moral expectancies of their society. Petrarch in defining the term "cives" wrote, "By citizens, of course, I mean those who love the existing order; for those who daily desire change are rebels and traitors, and against such, a stern justice may take its course."<sup>49</sup> It was the *novi cives* and their allies who best met Petrarch's definition.

This transvaluation of values, whereby the *novi cives* who had been regarded as the sowers of civic discord, in the age of Dante only to become the defenders of the commonwealth three generations later, finds expression in the lives and writings of the eminent humanists of the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries. To Coluccio Salutati, Florence was a city of "merchants and artisans," not of soldiers, knights

<sup>48</sup> Cf. especially, *C.P.*, vols. 14-15; *P.*, vols. 63, fols. 70r ff-66, fols. 1-53.

<sup>49</sup> *Epistolae Seniles*, XIV, 1, to Francesco di Carrera (28 November 1373). The relevant passage is cited by Jacob Burckhardt in *The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy* (New York, 1958), vol. I, p. 28.

and nobles, for without trade and industry the city could not hope to survive. It was the moderate guildsmen, great and small, who had acted to preserve the liberty of the people against the excesses of the *Parte Guelfa* and the *superbia* of the nobles.<sup>50</sup> This view comes to be imbedded in Florentine historiography until it is challenged by Machiavelli at the beginning of the sixteenth century. The prominent humanist, Leonardo Bruno Aretino, in the early Quattrocento, praised those popular regimes which the Greeks called "democratic" because it was only under this type of government that liberty and equality before the law could be safeguarded: "All our laws aim only for this, that the (Florentine) citizens may be equal because true liberty has roots only in equality."<sup>51</sup> This just condition could only be maintained, according to Bruni, if the most powerful families were prevented from monopolizing public office. Poggio Bracciolini, leading exponent of the classics, and a successor of Bruni in the Florentine chancellery, extolled trade and commerce because it was only through these activities that cities gained the wealth that made possible their splendor, beauty and art. He canonized bourgeois virtue by arguing that the desire for riches was good since it was natural to all men, and he condemned those who preached disrespect for material possessions as hypocrites.<sup>52</sup> Finally, it should be noted that Coluccio, Bruni and Poggio, along with their fellow humanists, Carlo Marzuppinini and Benedetto Accolti, were all *novi cives* and each, in turn, was elevated to the exalted office of Chancellor of the Republic. Unlike their famous predecessors, Brunetto Latini and Monachi, and their Trecento literary prototypes, Dante, Compagni and the Villanis, each of whom suffered political persecution at the hands of their compatriots, the later day humanists lived out their lives secure in the service of the State. That they were born in Arezzo, Terra Nuova or Stignano in Val di Nievole, was the occasion for neither scorn nor ridicule nor political proscription.

*Western Reserve University*

<sup>50</sup> E. Garin, 'I cancellieri umanisti della Repubblica Fiorentina,' *op. cit.*, 194-195. The same point of view is expressed in the *Diario di anonimo fiorentino*, *op. cit.*, pp. 291 ff.

<sup>51</sup> E. Garin, *op. cit.*, p. 200; H. Baron, *Humanistic and Political Literature in Florence and Venice at the Beginning of the Quattrocento* (Cambridge, Mass., 1955).

<sup>52</sup> E. Garin, *L'umanesimo italiano* (Bari, 1952), pp. 59-60; H. Baron, 'Franciscan Poverty and Civic Wealth as Factors in the Rise of Humanistic Thought,' *Speculum*, XIII (1938), 16 ff.

# The "Miller's Tale": An Interpretation

W. F. BOLTON

THE *Miller's Tale* has offered three principal problems to its students.<sup>1</sup> First, did Chaucer find combined in his source the elsewhere separate stories of the flood, the branding and the misplaced kiss, or did he combine them himself?<sup>2</sup> Next, what are we to make of the apparently incongruous elements of courtly and common, sacred and profane, realistic and fantastic?<sup>3</sup> Third, growing out of this, how did Chaucer, author of only a few surviving fabliaux, write a tale which is the zenith of the genre?<sup>4</sup> The questions of these students (to ignore the many studies that have touched only on details) can be restated as a concern with the organization of the *Tale* and with its success. How, for example, does it arrive at the "moral" of the last five lines?

Thus swyved was this carpenteris wyf,  
For al his keypyng and his jalousye;  
And Absolon hath kist hir nether ye;  
And Nicholas is scalded in the towte.  
This tale is doon, and God save al the rowte !<sup>5</sup> (I. 3850-3854)

<sup>1</sup> The general pattern of the *Miller's Tale* is discussed from different points of view but with similar results in a forthcoming article by Paul A. Olson and in *Preface to Chaucer* by Professor D.W. Robertson, Jr. (Princeton, 1962). On the method in these studies, see the symposium on patristic exegesis in *Critical Approaches to Medieval Literature*, ed. Dorothy Bethurum (New York, 1960), 1-82.

<sup>2</sup> Stith Thompson, 'The Miller's Tale,' in *Sources and Analogues of Chaucer's Canterbury Tales*, ed. W.F. Bryan and G. Dempster (Chicago, 1941), 106-123. There is little to justify Mrs. Dempster's earlier positive statement that "our poet certainly was not the first" to combine the motifs, *Dramatic Irony in Chaucer* (Palo Alto, 1932), 279. See W.W. Heist, 'Folklore Study and Chaucer's Fabliau-Like Tales,' *Papers of the Michigan Academy of Science, Arts and Letters* XXXVI (1950), 251 ff., and his references.

<sup>3</sup> E. g., E.M.W. Tillyard, *Poetry Direct and Oblique* (rev. ed., London, 1945), 92 *et passim*; C.A. Owen, Jr., 'Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales*: Aesthetic Design in the Stories of the First Day,' *English Studies* XXXV (1954), 51-52.

<sup>4</sup> E. g., Charles Muscatine, *Chaucer and the French Tradition* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1957), 224, 230; G. Stillwell, 'The Language of Love in Chaucer's Miller's and Reeve's Tales and in the Old French Fabliaux,' *Studies... in Memory of John Jay Parry* (Urbana, 1955), 212-218.

<sup>5</sup> References are to the text of F. N. Robinson, ed. *The Works of Geoffrey Chaucer* (2nd ed., Boston, 1957).

## I

If modern critics find themselves "in a ship al steerelees," they have at least the consolation of knowing that much of their difficulty is demonstrably the effect that Chaucer sought for. The frame of the story is full of questions for which the answers are nowhere in sight. Has the Miller referred to the *Tale* as "a noble tale for the nones, / With which I wol now quite the Knyghtes tale" (I.3126-3127) just because he is "a fool" whose "wit is overcome" (I.3135)? Is it what the Reeve calls it, "lewed dronken harlotrye" (I.3145)? Chaucer himself seems anxious not to be blamed for this "cherles tale":

And therfore every gentil wight I preye,  
 For Goddes love, demeth nat that I seye  
 Of yvel entente, but for I moot reherce  
 Hir tales alle, be they bettre or werse,  
 Or elles falsen som of my mateere.  
 And therfore, whoso list it nat yheere,  
 Turne over the leef and chese another tale;  
 For he shal fynde ynowe, grete and smale,  
 Of storial thyng that toucheth gentillesse,  
 And eek moralitee and hoolynesse.  
 Blameth nat me if that ye chese amys.  
 The Millere is a cherl, ye knowe wel this;  
 So was the Reve eek and othere mo,  
 And harlotrie they tolden bothe two.  
 Avyseth yow, and put me out of blame;  
 And eek men shal nat maken ernest of game. (I. 3171-3186)

Chaucer seems to say to modern critics, as Alice said to Nicholas, "do wey youre handes, for youre curteisye!" But "men shal nat maken ernest of game" recalls his words in the *Book of the Duchess*, "Y trowe no man had the wyt / To konne wel my sweven rede" (278-279) and the words of numberless other mediaeval authors who invited interpretation by denying that it was possible:

What pis meteles bemeneth . 3e men pat be merye,  
 Deuine 3e, for I ne dar · bi dere god in heuene !<sup>6</sup>

Chaucer's protest, moreover, is patently part of the fiction of the pilgrimage; it is, of course, Chaucer who has written the *Tale* of the Miller, as well as the words of the Reeve and of the fictional Chaucer.

It seems that the paradoxical pairs — courtly and common, sacred and profane, realistic and fantastic — were already part of Chaucer's plan when he wrote the *Miller's Prologue*. What the Miller says will be "a noble tale," Chaucer calls a "cherles tale"; what the Miller says will

<sup>6</sup> William Langland, *Piers the Plowman*, ed. W. W. Skeat (Oxford, 1923), Prol. 208-209.



The Bench-End at Brent Knoll (South Brent), Somerset.

*Photo F.H. Crossley.*

be "a legende and a lyf" — in an age when the words would recall collections like the South English Legendary — this the Reeve terms "lewed dronken harlotrye"; what "mateere" the author will not falsify is, nonetheless, a "game." And it is clear that modern critics have not had to turn over the leaf to find a story that "toucheth gentillesse, / And eek moralitee and hoolynesse." If they have not agreed on which is which, they have fared no worse than the original fictional audience of the *Tale*; Chaucer says that when it was over, "Diverse folk diversely they seyde, / But for the moore part they loughe and pleyde" (I.3857-3858).

## II

Among the few critics who have offered an interpretation of the *Tale* as a whole, K.B. Harder<sup>7</sup> has suggested that it is "a parody of the then current mystery pageants" much as the *Tale of Sir Thopas* is a parody of popular romance; the traditional figures of Pilate and Herod have been worked into the characterization of the Miller and Absolon, and "the carpenter episode parodies a Noah play." Paul N. Siegel, in another attempt to account for the role of scriptural elements in the *Tale*,<sup>8</sup> has argued that the repeated use of "save" in the poem is a pun, referring at once to salvation from the Deluge, to eternal salvation, and to salvation from the flames of desire. His conclusion,

The action is that of the world of comedy, where not the transgressions of moral law but the violations of good sense are punished, but this world of comedy is set against a religious backdrop which renders the action ironically trivial by the perspective it suggests,<sup>9</sup>

if supported, would resolve many of the problems in the *Tale*, and would be congruent with the findings of Donaldson (below) in the matter of courtly tone; but like Harder, he has overlooked too much of the "religious backdrop" to make a meaningful appraisal of it.

The most methodical study of the *Tale*, and the most significant, is E. Talbot Donaldson's demonstration that much of its language is derived from the idiom of popular romance.<sup>10</sup> He shows, for example, that "hende," the epithet for Nicholas, passed in meaning from "handy, near at hand," to "skillful, clever" and finally to "nice, courteous,

<sup>7</sup> 'Chaucer's Use of the Mystery Plays in the *Miller's Tale*,' *Modern Language Quarterly* XVII (1956), 193-198.

<sup>8</sup> 'Comic Irony in *The Miller's Tale*,' *Boston University Studies in English* IV (1960), 114-120. Siegel's comment that "privee" and its cognates "are constantly being used of the sly, secretive Nicholas" misses the point; the words *are* used five times of Nicholas, but also four times of John, twice of Absolon, once of Alice and once of the Miller himself.

<sup>9</sup> Siegel, 119.

<sup>10</sup> 'Idiom of Popular Poetry in the *Miller's Tale*,' *English Institute Essays* (1950), 116-140.

pleasant." Especially in the third sense, it is common in descriptions of courtly heroes. But, he points out, it appears in only two other places in Chaucer, once when the Host implores the Friar to be "hende" to the Summoner, and once when Alice of Bath calls her Jankin "hende." The word had, for Chaucer, become declass  through over-use in mediocre romances, and its chief value for him was ironic. Other such phrases include "whit as... the blosme upon the rys" and "whit as morne milk," usually similes for feminine skin, but here for Absolon's surplice and Alice's apron. Although Donaldson does not mention it, this last ironic effect is achieved through the separation of the person and the traditional attribute. It is not Absolon and Alice who are fair, but their clothes; their resemblance to figures in a courtly romance is not even skin-deep, but a guise, a garment, and a garment which both are ready to remove. The effect of this use of courtly clich s on characters for whom they were never intended, Donaldson says, is to make the *Tale* into a parody of popular romance; to reinforce its connection with the *Knight's Tale*, which it was meant to requite; and to make it more humorous in itself.

Donaldson might have availed himself of other material in the *Tale* — the explicit denial of courtly assumptions in

She was a prymerole, a piggesnye,  
For any lord to leggen in his bedde,  
Or yet for any good yeman to wedde,

(I.3268-3270)

or under-cutting puns like "so woweth hire that hym is wo bigon" (I.3372), but he is clearly right that the courtly elements in this Hogarthian world are not paradoxical. They are a deliberate incongruity, a catalogue of romance commonplaces calculated to make the love-longings of everyday Oxford look even more foolish than they already did. This ironic effect, nonetheless, is chiefly supplementary, not integral, to the plot; Donaldson's analysis resolves some of the difficulties of tone and description in the *Tale*, but it brings us no nearer to the understanding of an organizing principle.

A useful start in this direction is the paper of Paul E. Beichner, CSC,<sup>11</sup> who points out that the Absalom of the Bible (II *Reg.* 14.25-26) typified, for mediaeval commentators, masculine beauty, and that his famous hair — by tradition golden — typified excess. The similarities in appearance and traditional moral connotations with Absolon's scriptural

<sup>11</sup> 'Absolon's Hair,' *Mediaeval Studies* XII (1950), 222-233. Father Beichner has presented his position more fully in a recent article: 'Characterization in the *Miller's Tale*' in *Chaucer Criticism; The Canterbury Tales*, edit. R. J. Schoeck and Jerome Taylor (Notre Dame, Ind., 1960), 117-129.

namesake, Fr. Beichner argues, suggest that Chaucer purposely introduced him in place of the smith who plays his role in the analogues of the misplaced kiss. This conclusion, which adduces scriptural traditions much as Donaldson's study adduced those of popular romance, and which goes well beyond the suggestions of Harder and Siegel, encourages further investigation along the same lines in the hope of similar results, always with the proviso that material close to Chaucer in time and language is the most convincing source for the intellectual equipment he may have expected his audience to have.<sup>12</sup>

### III

The Absolon of the *Miller's Tale* suffers from an excess of pride. Unlike Alice's husband or her lover, he approaches her only after preening himself carefully: three times his painstaking toilet is mentioned.

Crul was his heer, and as the gold it shoon,  
And strouted as a fanne large and brode ... (I.3314-3315)

He kembeth his lokkes brode, and made hym gay ... (I.3374)

Up rist this joly love-re Absolon,  
And hym arraieþ gay, at poynt-devys.  
But first he cheweth greyn and lycors,  
To smellen sweete, er he hadde kembd his heer. (I.3688-3691)

But this combination of elegant good looks and *superbia* is traditionally doomed to disaster:

and þou warte ... as fayre as euer Absolon was,  
þat was þe fayrest man on erthe; ȝ iff pride  
folowe þe, it will destrew all pese.  
Si tibi copia seu sapiencia formaque detur,  
Sola superbia destruet omnia si comitetur.<sup>13</sup>

<sup>12</sup> For this purpose I have relied chiefly on three published collections of Middle English sermons: *Mirk's Festial*, ed. T. Erbe, EETS Extra Series XCVI (London, 1905), "West of England ... from about 1400" (Wells' *Manual*, 301), hereafter *Mirk*; *Speculum Sacerdotale*, ed. E. H. Weatherly, EETS Original Series CC (London, 1936), London dialect, early fifteenth century (p. xx), hereafter *SS*; and *Middle English Sermons*, ed. W.O. Ross, EETS Original Series CCIX (London, 1940), Oxford dialect, late fourteenth and early fifteenth century (pp. xxxi-xxxviii), hereafter *ME Sermons*. I have also made some use of Augustine, Jerome and Bede, to whom—along with Gregory the Great—the authors of the sermons regularly referred: *Mirk* 1/22, 279/2, 2/29, 5/12, 128/4, 152/32; *ME Sermons* 157/12, 257/18, 328/28, 227/26, 248/20, 68/14; *SS* 64/7, 81/25, 117/25, 196/5, 210/11, ch. 8 (see p. xxvii). Like the specific commentaries of these four, their allegorical method was perpetuated in the fourteenth century by its repeated use in vernacular sermons, e.g., *ME Sermons* 104/1-105/16; *Mirk* 103/26-35, and especially *SS* 118/3-13.

<sup>13</sup> *ME Sermons* 68/4-12.



Again unlike John and Nicholas, Absolon receives no physical injury at the end of the *Tale*; only his pride is wounded.

Nicholas' name recalls both St. Nicholas of Myra and *Apoc.* 2.14-15:

Sed habeo adversus te pauca: quia habes illic tenentes doctrinam Balaam, qui docebat Balac mittere scandalum coram filiis Israel, edere, et fornicari: Ita habes et tu tenentes doctrinam Nicolaitarum.

In his commentary on this passage, Augustine makes it clear that the Nicolaites, like the followers of Balaam, were regarded as fornicators and gluttons; his commentary also provides the source for a number of Nicholas' other characteristics:

Nicolaitae a Nicolao nominati sunt ... Iste cum de zelo pulcherrimae conjugis culparetur, velut purgandi se causa permisisse fertur, ut ea qui vellet uteretur. Quod ejus factum in sectam turpissimam versum est, qua placet usus indifferens feminarum. Hi nec ab iis quae idolis immolantur cibos suos separant: et alios ritus gentilium superstitionum non aversantur. Narant etiam quaedam fabulosa de mundo, nescio quae barbara principum nomina miscentes disputationibus suis, quibus terreant auditores: quae prudentibus risum potius faciunt, quam timorem. Intelliguntur autem etiam isti non Deo tribuere creaturam, sed quibusdam potestatibus, quas mirabili vel fingunt vanitate, vel credunt.<sup>14</sup>

Nicholas combines both Nicolaite excesses in one: he is a gluttonous fornicator. His abrupt approach to Alice suggests as much, as does his care to supply himself with meat and drink during his feigned illness. Nicholas' room is decorated with herbs, and he spends Saturday in what Langland had described as the glutton's typical indulgences, eating and sleeping.<sup>15</sup> When Absolon dreams he is at a feast and interprets the dream as a sign of his coming success with Alice, we know that the sexual feast is a reality, but that it is Nicholas, not Absolon, who is feasting.

The other connotation of Nicholas' name, that of St. Nicolas of Myra, seems to go no further than a general ironic allusion to his traditional patronage of mariners.<sup>16</sup>

The name "John" means "Domini gratia," according to Bede's commentary on *Luke* 1.13.<sup>17</sup> Nicholas says that John will have "as greet a grace as Noe hadde" (I.3560), and that they must get into their tubs in the barn "And sitten there, abidyng Goddes grace" (I.3595). The

<sup>14</sup> *De Haeresibus*, PL XLII, col. 26. Gluttony and lechery are regularly regarded as aspects of the same sin in this context.

<sup>15</sup> *Piers the Plowman*, Prol. 43-45, V 364-371.

<sup>16</sup> K. Meisen, *Nikolauskult und Nikolausbrauch im Abendlande* (Düsseldorf, 1931) 245-249; *Mirk* 13/8-11.

<sup>17</sup> *In Lucae Evangelium Expositio*, PL XCII, col. 312.

evangelist John was believed to have had "specyall grace . . . grace of vyrgynyte, and grace of kepyng of [Christ's] modyr fre, and grace of schowyng of his pryuyte,"<sup>18</sup> the last of which is emphasized: "Goddys pryuyte," "hys priuete," "þe priuete of God," "Goddys priuete," "Goddys pryuyte."<sup>19</sup> The traditional associations of his name contrast with John's declaration that "Men sholde nat knowe of Goddes pryvetee" (I.3454).

John is, as Noah was perforce, a carpenter. Jerome<sup>20</sup> observed of *Isaiah* 44.13, "Artifex lignarius extendit normam, formavit illud in runcina," that the carpenters were the idolaters, those who worshipped the creature rather than the Creator. John is such a one. Chaucer describes him as a "riche gnof" (I.3188) whose "kepyng" (I.3851) is his characteristic vice, and who looks forward to becoming lord of all the world after the second flood. This characteristic vice, like Absolon's pride and Nicholas' gluttony, is emphasized in his attitude toward Alice; he is her jealous idolater. He loves her "moore than his lyf" (I.3222), his jealousy is referred to four times (I.3224, I.3294, I.3404, I.3851). His "kepyng" is the moral opposite of the second grace granted to the evangelist, just as his revelation is a counterfeite of the third.

Although "Alice" is not a scriptural name, it is common in mediaeval literature. The Old French song of "la bele Aeliz" is quoted in several versions in *Le Roman de Guillaume de Dole*<sup>21</sup> and alluded to in Marie's *Lai de L'Espine*,<sup>22</sup> and the Middle English poem *Alysoun*<sup>23</sup> is a further witness to her popularity. Two sermons illuminate the two mediaeval connotations of her name. One, by Stephen Langton,<sup>24</sup> begins by quoting a version of the Old French song:

Bele Aliz matin leva,  
 sun cors vesti e para,  
 enz un verger s'en entra,  
 cink flurettes y truva,  
 un chapelet fet en a  
 de rose flurie :  
 pur deu trahez vus en là,  
 vus ki ne amez mie :  
 Legimus, quod de omni verbo otioso reddituri sumus deo ratio-

<sup>18</sup> *Mirk* 31/1-3.

<sup>19</sup> *Mirk* 32/17; 32/24; 33/5; 33/30; 34/7.

<sup>20</sup> In *Isaiah Prophetam*, PL XXIV, col. 437.

<sup>21</sup> Ed. G. Servois, SATF (Paris, 1893), II. 310, 318, 531, 541, 1572, 5413.

<sup>22</sup> Quoted by Legrand d'Aussy, *Fabliaux...* (3rd ed. Paris, 1829), vol. IV, p. 11 of appendix.

<sup>23</sup> Ed. Carleton Brown in *English Lyrics of the XIIIth Century* (Oxford, 1932), 138-139.

<sup>24</sup> Ed. T. Wright, 'Description of MS Arundel No. 292 in the British Museum,' in *Altdeutsche Blätter*, ed. M. Haupt and H. Hoffmann, vol. II (Leipzig, 1840), 141-148, and here collated with the MS.

nem in die iudicii. Et ideo debemus errantes corrigere, errores reprimere, prava in bonis exponere, vanitatem ad veritatem reducere.<sup>25</sup>

The other sermon, by Jacques de Vitry,<sup>26</sup> mentions only four lines of the song (in another version) as descriptive of feminine worldly vanity, but Langton goes on to explicate the song as a glorification of the Virgin:

Et dicitur hoc nomen Aliz, ab à quod est sine, et lis litis, quasi sine lite, sine reprehensione, sine mundana fece. Et hec est regina justicie, mater misericordie. Ceste est la bele Aliz, ceste est la flur, ceste est le lis. Sequitur *Matin se leva, sun cors vesti e para*; unde habemus 'Adorna thalamum tuum Syon'. Ista bele Aliz, i.e. beata virgo Maria, adornavit thalamum suum, i.e. mentis conscienciam, quando concepit regem celorum et dominum.<sup>27</sup>

The name — like the language of the *Song of Songs* which frequently formed its context — could refer, then, either to celestial or to mundane love, either to Mary or to her antitype, the eternal Eve. (Chaucer used her name twice elsewhere, once for Alice of Bath, once for her otherwise unknown "gossip," who had been landlady to a "hende" clerk of Oxford.)

The mediaeval practice of giving characters significant names, at work in Absolon, Nicholas and John, encouraged a kind of folk etymology which we can see in Langton's interpretation of "Aliz" as well as in the *Second Nun's Prologue* with its interpretations of "Cecilie." The long tradition of mediaeval dictionaries of the received meaning of names and words, from Jerome's *De Nominibus Hebraicis* to Isidore of Seville's *Etymologiae*, had culminated in Chaucer's lifetime with the encyclopaedic *Dictionarium seu Repertorium Morale* of the French humanist Pierre Bersuire. Bersuire wrote of the verb "allicere,"

Idem est quod attrahere aliquem ad aliquod faciendum per verbum vel nutum vel factum applausium; sicut faciunt adulescentes. Et nota quod homo quandoque allicitur ad bonum quandoque ad malum. Nota etiam quod hominem alliciunt ad malum carnalia temporalia. Adulationes munera etc.<sup>28</sup>

The type-name Alice, both "ad bonum" and "ad malum," seems to stem from this fourteenth-century understanding of "allicere," and Bersuire's

<sup>25</sup> Wright, 143. For the critical practice of imposing a meaning on the text, cf. Augustine, *De Doctrina Christiana*, I,xxxvi.40.

<sup>26</sup> Ed. T. F. Crane, *The Exempla or Illustrative Stories from the Sermones Vulgares of Jacques de Vitry* (London, 1890), 114.

<sup>27</sup> Wright, 144.

<sup>28</sup> Edition of 1489, fol. n3<sup>v</sup>. For Bersuire and Chaucer, see D.W. Robertson, Jr., 'Why the Devil Wears Green,' *Modern Language Notes* LXIX (1954), 470-472. For "munera" as a generalization which subsumes the other three attractions, see my 'The Background and Meaning of *Guthlac*', *Jnl. of English and Germanic Philology* LX (1960).

first three kinds of worldly enticement — “carnalia, temporalia, adulationes” — are represented by the besetting sins of Nicholas, John and Absolon, respectively.

## IV

The similar grouping of the three male characters and the remarks of Bersuire is not merely coincidental. The sins of pride, avarice and greed (and/or lust) formed a pattern into which writers and artisans of Chaucer's time cast their understanding of a number of scriptural texts, and on which they based their conception of other more local situations. “For we se that ther beth thre maner of synnes, *scilicet*, pryde, lecherye, and auarice.”<sup>29</sup> Paul, David and Matthew, respectively, were grouped together as those who were first conquered by these sins and who later overcame them.<sup>30</sup> The temptations of Christ in the wilderness were these three, in order to redeem mankind from the taint incurred when Eve succumbed to them: “þe deuyll . . . come to Eue yn paradyce . . . forto tempt hur of gloteny, of vayne glory, and of couetyce. Ryght so he come to Crist . . . and temptyd hym of þat same synne.”<sup>31</sup> The first commandment was an injunction against these three sins; the prohibition against idolatry

is to vndirstond þus, for cause þat no þinge shuld be more loved þan God . . . þer be iij maner of pepull þat folowip þe iij enmyes, þe flesh, þe world, and þe feend. þei specially breke þis Commaundement, for þei loue more þese iij enmyes þan God. The first maner of peple beþ lecherous men and glotons . . . The second maner of men . . . be covetyze men . . . The ij, maner of men . . . be þo þat settis here hertes most on wordely worschippei veynglorie, an hignes on them-selfe.<sup>32</sup>

The words of John the Evangelist, “Euery synne þat is donne in pis werlde . . . oþur itt is þe synne of pride in lyvyng, oþur it is vnskilfull couetise, or itt is synne of flesly luste and lykyng”<sup>33</sup> provided the text for a sermon which includes the observations “who-so desireþ worshipp and pride in pis werlde . . . he shall fynde confucion to hym when þat he wold com to þe blisse of heven” and “be a man neuer so old, he is as freshe in couetyse as is þe yongest man in a countree.”<sup>34</sup> Of the parable of the supper (Luke 14. 18-20) Bede wrote<sup>35</sup> that the guest who declined because he bought a farm was the victim of avarice; the one who had a new yoke of oxen, of pride; and the one who had a new wife, of lust.

<sup>29</sup> SS 22/10-11.

<sup>30</sup> SS 209/31-210/18.

<sup>31</sup> Mirk 83/7-11.

<sup>32</sup> ME Sermons 106/36-107/32.

<sup>33</sup> ME Sermons 207/9-13.

<sup>34</sup> ME Sermons 208/20-23 (cf. *De Doctrina Christiana* II.xxiii.35); 210/2-3.

The influence of this tradition was felt not only in "secular" writing like the *Miller's Tale* but in even more popular situations like the bench-end at Brent Knoll (South Brent), Somerset, where a fox in ecclesiastical garb is depicted in the centre panel, proudly preaching to a multitude of birds and beasts, while in the lower panel two gluttonous monkeys roast a pig and in the upper panel another monkey holds a bag of money. The concept of the three principal sins was a commonplace of patristic exegesis which vernacular preaching made available to the laity in a number of contexts, and which writers and artisans could employ as an organizing scheme in their own work; in the *Miller's Tale* it draws the folk-stories of the misplaced kiss, the branding and the flood together in a new and morally more significant pattern.

Another aspect of this pattern is Chaucer's remark that "Som folk wol ben wonnen for richesse, / And somme for strokes, and somme for gentillesse" (I.3381-3382). In this context "strokes" surely means "caresses," and in this *Tale* — especially in Absolon's case — "gentillesse" is not *vera nobilitas* but a prideful imitation of it. There is, in fact, textual reason for associating John, Nicholas and Absolon with "richesse . . . strokes and . . . gentillesse" respectively. John is introduced as "a riche gnof." When Nicholas has made his arrangements with Alice, he "thakked hire aboute the lendes weel" (I.3304). Absolon hymself "syngeth in his voys gentil and smal" (I.3360). Similarly, in the last lines of the *Tale*, John's "kepyng," his avarice, is foiled; carnal Nicholas is wounded in the flesh; and prideful Absolon is humiliated.

## V

Other examples of the "religious backdrop" in the *Tale* are of a more direct but less integral kind. One instance is the maxim quoted to John by Nicholas, "Werk al by conseil, and thou shalt nat rewe" (I.3530), taken out of context from *Ecclus.* 32.24-26:

Fili sine consilio nihil facias, et post factum non poenitebis. In via ruinae non eas, et non offendes in lapides: nec credas te viae laboriosae, ne ponas animae tuae scandalum: et a filiis tuis cave, et a domesticis tuis attende.<sup>35</sup>

<sup>35</sup> In *Lucae Evangelium Expositio*, PL XCII, cols. 514-515. The idea was widespread in the Middle Ages, and had a continued meaning for the sixteenth century, as in John Colet's *Aeditio* (Antwerp, 1537), where the young scholar promises to "abstayne frome al syne as moche as I may / specially from the synnes dedly. / I shal not be proude / nor enuious / nor wrothful, / I shal not be glotonous / nor lecherous / nor slouthful. / I shal not be couetous desiringe superfluite of worldly thinges /" (fol. A iiir).

<sup>36</sup> C. F. Bühler, 'Wirk Alle Thyng by Conseil,' *Speculum* XXIV (1949), 410-412, has recorded the proverbial intermediaries between *Ecclesiasticus* and Chaucer, but he has neglected the scriptural context which gives the phrase its irony.

The last line is the most arresting in its pertinence to the *Tale*, but the repetition of *scandalum* from the passage on Nicolaites should not be overlooked.

The next two instances of scriptural allusion are shorter and rather like one another. The first is Alice's remark when Absolon comes looking for a kiss, "Go forth thy wey, or I wol caste a ston" (I.3712); the woman taken in adultery proposes to be the one to cast the stone. A few lines later Absolon visits the smithy, "And caughte the kultour by the colde stele" (I.3785), turning a plow-share into a sword.

Almost certainly there is more scriptural material employed in this way in the *Miller's Tale*, but the foregoing already provides a consistent pattern.<sup>37</sup> It is much the same kind of pattern as Donaldson discovered in Chaucer's use of courtly cliché, that is, the thing is turned into a grotesque of the original. The difference is that the scriptural pattern forms the paradigm on which the *Tale* is constructed, and the scriptures are — unlike the popular romances — undiminished in stature. The scriptural pattern, then, is more integral to the *Tale* than is the courtly one, and the contrasts it provides are more striking.

This disparity between the traditional connotations of the scriptural material and those of its distorted form in the *Tale* is clear in the attitudes of its two audiences., Among the fictional audience, "Diverse folk diversely they seyde," depending, it now seems, on their varying comprehension of the conventional pattern underlying the *Tale*. In the real audience, on the other hand, Chaucer can reasonably have expected the disparity to be recognized. The plot is a web of deceptions, but only the characters are deceived; the audience understands the pattern of their vices and the predictable outcome of their folly. Along with the repeated references to secrecy in words like "deerne," "privee," "sleigh," are the references to impaired vision and lost reason. Nicholas succeeded with Alice when Absolon "fer was from hire sight" (I.3395); Robin first glimpsed Nicholas through the cat's door (I.3440-3443); John hoped to hail Nicholas on Tuesday morning with "I se thee wel" (I.3580) but the darkness on Monday night ruins them all. John fears Nicholas has fallen into "woodnesse" (I.3452); his wife, his lodger and his neighbors four times call him "wood" (I.3507; I.3846; I.3833; I.3848); Absolon loses Alice "though that [he] be wood" (I.3394); the coming deluge is to be "wilde and wood" (I.3517); Robin knocks at the door "as that he were wood" (I.3436); and the scalded clerk twice cries out in the same fashion (I.3814; I.3817). The vocabulary of blindness and

<sup>37</sup> E. g., R. E. Kaske, 'Patristic Exegesis: The Defense,' in Bethurum, *op. cit.* (note 1 above), 52-60 and note 2.

madness, physical and mental folly, fulfills the expectations which the scriptural structure has prompted in the *Tale's* real audience.

The insight of the audience into precisely those matters where the "sleigh" characters are the least perceptive gives the *Tale* the property of dramatic irony, and this property is extended into the frame: Chaucer's "gentillesse, / And eek moralitee and hoolynesse" appear, but only through their contrasting antitypes in the dominant vices of the principal characters.<sup>38</sup> In this irony Chaucer too takes full part; as a pilgrim he regards the *Tale* as "game," a fictional pose which itself directs our attention to his real purposes as author. The *Tale* exists in the tension between opposites such as audience awareness and character (and "teller") ignorance; pilgrim and author Chaucer; the profane characters and the sacred figures they recall; the distorted moral themes and their scriptural context. Chaucer's organization of the three old stories into the *Miller's Tale* on the pattern of conventional figures and themes creates, but is not destroyed by, this tension; as in his allusions by antitype, the inversion recalls rather than eradicates its opposite. The organization and the success of the *Tale* depend on the juxtaposition of courtly and common, sacred and profane, realistic and fantastic, in a single ironic statement.

### *University of Reading*

<sup>38</sup> Alice is also an antitype of Noah's wife: the traditional "sorwe of Noe with his felaweshipe, / Er that he myght gete his wyf to shipe" (I.3539-3540), contrasts sharply with her eager "Allas! go forth thy wey anon, / Help us to scape, or we been dede echon!" (I.3607-3608).

# Gervase of Tilbury's Addenda to his "Otia Imperialia"

JAMES R. CALDWELL

IN the second and third of a series of three articles on the manuscripts of the *Otia Imperialia*<sup>1</sup> I have referred to a substantial amount of material evidently collected and composed by Gervase, attached as addenda to certain unpublished manuscripts of the work. It is here proposed to present in part, and in part to describe these addenda, noting the evidence that they are Gervase's own additions, observing how they reveal a mediaeval book in the process of composition, and considering certain clues which they afford to the date of the conclusion or abandonment of the work.

In the third of the articles mentioned an attempt was made to show that while the majority of the copies derive from the autograph, MS N (Vat. Lat. 933) in pretty much its final stage, the manuscript tradition derives also in part from another author's version ( $\beta$ ) now lost. This lost version was the source of ten copies, products of the 13th (?) to the 16th centuries, viz:

|   |                   |
|---|-------------------|
| MS E. Wolfenbittel, <i>Helms</i> 481,         | XIII or XIV cent. |
| F, Toulouse 448                               | early XVI cent..  |
| G, Paris, Bibl. Nat., <i>Lat.</i> 6491,       | XV cent.          |
| I, Paris, Bibl. Nat., <i>Lat.</i> 6492,       | XV cent.          |
| M, Madrid, Bibl. Nac. 6213,                   | XV cent.          |
| c, Brussels, Bibl. Roy. 4562,                 | XV cent.          |
| W, Paris, Bibl. Nat., 6492A,                  | XV cent.          |
| X, Vatican, <i>Vat. Lat.</i> 993,             | XIV and XV cent.  |
| Z, Aberystwith, Nat. Lib. <i>Wales</i> 5009C, | XV cent.          |
| a, Paris, Bibl. Nat., <i>Lat.</i> 13959,      | end of XV cent.   |

These manuscripts are presented in the article referred to as comprising Group II of the four major groups into which the 28 copies

<sup>1</sup> 'The Autograph Manuscript of Gervase of Tilbury (Vatican, *Vat. Lat.* 933),' *Scriptorium* XI, 1 (1957), 87-98; 'Manuscripts of Gervase of Tilbury's *Otia Imperialia*,' *Scriptorium* XVI, 1 (1962), 28-45; 'Interrelationships of the Manuscripts of Gervase of Tilbury's *Otia Imperialia*,' *Scriptorium* XVI, 2 (1962).



are divisible. The evidence indicates also that Group II is capable of subdivision into sub-groups IIa (E F G I M c) and IIb (W X Z a).  $\beta$ , the source of the MSS of Group II, was seen to have been, like N, eked out with marginalia. The two "originals" were evidently intended, as the author worked on them, to be kept identical by a process of cross-copying. At one stage, however, each evidently lacked marginalia which had been entered in the other. Ultimately all of the marginalia of  $\beta$  were carried over to N, while  $\beta$ , according to the evidence of its descendants, was left wanting a few, or portions of a few, of N's entries.

The addenda appear, more or less complete and in various relationships to the text-proper, in the MSS I, X, a, W, L, and S. Their appearance in L, an exemplar of Group IV, is for our purposes insignificant, for in that manuscript they are merely copied in a 17th century hand verbatim from I. In MS S (Group III), they are also an addition in a second hand. They attach, in other words, properly to Group II, and since we find addenda attached to exemplars of both sub-groups (IIa and IIb), it seems reasonable to conclude that they were originally attached to  $\beta$ , the common source of these.

They are most abundant and in most primitive relationship to the text in MS I, to which thirty-one items are attached at the close of the work. In the other manuscripts having addenda, certain items have been integrated with the text proper; others are wanting. Thus MS X integrates items 1-7, wants item 8, and integrates 9-16. MS a wants items 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, and evidently by loss of a leaf, all but the first line of item 29, and all of 30 and 31. It integrates items 3, 7 and 9-16. MSS S and W want items 1-8 and integrate 9-16. It will be convenient, therefore, to examine them as they appear in MS I. Before doing so, however, it may be observed that the fact of the existence of supplements to MS W was noted by Michelant and dismissed by Liebrecht as follows :

In der *Hist. Litter. de la France* XVII, 106 wird übrigens noch eine andere Pariser Handschrift, jedoch nur der dritten Decisio des Gervasius erwähnt, welche mehr enthält als die übrigen. Auf eine deshalbig Anfrage erwiederte mir Herr Michelant: "Le manuscrit désigné dans l'*Hist. Litter. de la France* contient en effet à la fin 14 à 15 pages environ de récits que ne se trouvent pas dans les autres Mss. Voici d'après les annotations marginales le contenu de ce supplément: *De gestis Alexandri — de scorpionibus — de serpentibus — de crocodilis — de signis in morte Alexandri — de signis in morte Karoli — de VII dormientibus — de umbra — de Caribdi — de Judaeis — de opobalsamo — de diversis legibus — de historicis romanorum — de formis civitatum — portae Romae — pontes Romae — montes in Roma — de palaciis — de templis — mirabile (sic) in nativitate XI.*" Dieser ganze Zusatz ist jedoch offenbar eine nicht dem Gervasius angehörende Interpolation, da, nach den Ueberschriften zu urtheilen, vieles darin

enthalten ist, was jener selbst schon besprochen hat, z.B. die ganze Topographie Roms; andererseits auch scheint mir das Uebrige nichts besonders wichtiges zu enthalten.<sup>2</sup>

How far such dismissal is warranted will perhaps appear in what follows. Meanwhile, let us examine them as they occur in I. MS I concludes the *Otia Imperialia* with Chapter 126 of Book III, which is followed by the letter of presentation to John Marcus. This letter is in turn followed by a blank page (f. 218v) after which (interrupted at two points by tables of the chapters of Section III) appear the addenda. The first eight items were evidently marked, in the version from which I derives, for integration at specific points in the *Otio*. The first item is superscribed with the direction, Folio XII (later hand) *ad hoc signum*. Items 2-7 are similarly superscribed, but the scribe of I has, in copying the formula of direction, left no space for the folio numbers, and supplied no signs.

Identifiable sources of the addenda, followed with varying degrees of fidelity, are Justin's *Epitome* of Trogius Pompeius' *Phillipic Histories*,<sup>3</sup> Paulus Diaconus' *History of the Lombards*,<sup>4</sup> *The Epistle of Alexander to Aristotle*,<sup>5</sup> Julius Valerius' *Epitome*,<sup>6</sup> and Einhard's *Life of Charlemagne*.<sup>7</sup>

For one item I have been unable to find a literary source; eight others are evidently of Gervase's own composition. Let us now examine them.

Their presentation has in fact presented something of a tactical problem, for in large part they constitute textually corrupt fragments of their well-known and readily accessible sources; hence total reproduction of them would be of doubtful use. Indeed, the eight which are Gervase's own are accessible in the Leibnitz edition of the *Otia*,<sup>8</sup> and there is obviously no need for reprinting these. In general therefore it has seemed practicable to describe the addenda, item by item, in terms of what they take from their sources rather than to present them in full, presenting, nevertheless, sample passages illustrating Gervase's use of

<sup>2</sup> Felix Liebrecht, *Des Gervasius Von Tilbury Otia Imperialia* (1856) xiv-xv.

<sup>3</sup> Ed. Otto Seel, Teubner, 1935.

<sup>4</sup> Ed. G. Waitz, *Scriptores Rerum Langobardicarum*; *Mon. Germ. Hist.* 1878.

<sup>5</sup> W. Walther Boer, (Leyden Diss.) The Hague, 1953. Also S. Rypins, *Three Old English Prose Texts*, pp. 77-100.

<sup>6</sup> Ed. Julius Zacher, Halle, 1867.

<sup>7</sup> Ed. H. W. Garrod and R. B. Mowat, 1925.

<sup>8</sup> *Scriptores Rerum Brunsvicensium* I, pp. 999-1000; 1004, under the titles: De mortuo, qui apparet virgini; De Racemis Ingustabilibus; De fonte qui tempore metendorum pratorum apparet; De aqua de qua sanantur gutturnosi; De fonte qui repente perditur reddit; De duobus fontibus; De fonte qui nihil sordidum admittit.

each source, and such other passages from the addenda as, for one reason or another, are convenient to set forth. Among these latter obviously is the first item, for which I have found no literary source.

## THE ADDENDA

### 1

Sunt autem hec nomina celorum: Rachia [Rākī'a], id est extensorium, de quo dixit David: "extendens celum sicut pelles." Hoc Latini dicunt "firmamentum," in quo sunt signa, astra et planete. Super illud est celum quod vocant Sammāim [Shamayīm], compositum ex *sam*, quod est "hic" et *māim* quod interpretatur quasi dicat, "mirra sunt in eo et soli Deo sunt cognita." Quippe *man* vocat<sup>9</sup> "que hic<sup>10</sup> admirative," unde *manna*. Cum ergo celos, et ea que in eis sunt fecit Deus in intellectu, quasi sibi soli intellecta, dicuntur ea *māym*, id est, "que hic admirative." Est autem *sammāim* quasi nomen ratione omnibus celis. Super illud est celum quod dicitur *sahachim* [Sh'ḥākīm]. Super illud est *sevul* [Z'bhūl],<sup>11</sup> super illud *Maon* [Mā'ōn], super illud *Machon* [Mākhōn], super illud *Aranoh* ['Ārābhōth]. Sub Rachia dicunt quasi esse velum, quod Ebreus *Velon* nominat, quod mane extenditur et vespere constringitur, quo collecto apparent sidera. Verum ex nimio splendore suo sol illud in die transverberans apparet solus. Ad hoc Ebreus vii notat esse terras, id est vii diversitates terrarum. Dum hec culta est, illa unculta, et cum terram indistincte nominent, hanc tamen cultam dicunt Ebrei *tevel* [Tēbhēl], incultam *mithbar* [Midhbār]. Unde in psalmo xxiii<sup>o</sup> "*Adonay ha areth intiola tevel*" [la-'Ādhōnai hā-'āres ū-m'ēlōāh tēbhēl], hoc est, "Domini est terra et plenitudo eius et habitatores in ea." *Viosue bazamlut* [sic (?) MSS] [v'e-yōsh'ebhē bhāh]. Ergo *māym* alibi notat "aquas"; tamen in opere supra dicto notat quedam corpora superlunaria et non intellecta. Unde ait Moyses: "*Wiomer*"<sup>12</sup> [vay-yōmer], et dixerit *Eloym* [Elōhīm] Deus *gehi* [yehī], sit *Rachia*,<sup>13</sup> id est extensorium vel firmamentum, *bet hoc* [b'ethokh] in medio *hamaym* [ham-māyīm], "id est corporum superiorum et inferiorum, quasi superans ea. Sicut autem superiora quedam sunt viventia ut angeli, quedam non, ut astra, ita inferiora quedam sunt animantia, quedam non. Sed omnia inferiora sunt visibilia, et non superiora, de quibus supra dixerat: "Et spiritus Domini ferebatur super aquas." Non ergo secundum Hebreum sunt aque super celos sed *māym*, id est quedam invisibilia et non intellecta. Unde Moyses: "*Brosith* [B'rē'shith], In principio *bara* [bārā] creavit *Eloym* [Elōhīm], Deus *et* [eth] autem *hassamaym* [hash-shamayīm], celum *vareth* [v'e-'eth hā-'āreṣ], et terram." Cum ergo prius fecisa set celum et terram indistincta et confuse in yle, secunda die distinxit superiorab inferioribus, id est non intelligibilia ab intelligibilibus construens. Quasi dyat fragma quod in hominem separat spiritualia a vitalibus et illud medium voca

<sup>9</sup> notat, MS X.

<sup>10</sup> Thus X; *quid hic*, MS I.

<sup>11</sup> Thus X; *euum* (?), MS I.

<sup>12</sup> Thus X; *venio in c.*, MS I.

<sup>13</sup> Thus X; *rachul*, MS I.

<sup>14</sup> Borrowed from *oceanus* or Ὠκεανός?

Ebreus *Rachiam*, Latinus "firmamentum." Et quia terra aquis circumclusa non apparebat, congregavit aquas in locum quem Ebrei nominant *uchianos*<sup>14</sup> et ita separata ab aquis apparuit arida. Dicit ergo Ebreus aquas non esse super celos, sed tantum sub celis. Terra vero, quasi centrum et ponderosa, nec ascendere potest nec descendere.<sup>15</sup> Cum tamen corpus sit spericum et ascenderet et descenderet omni motu suo circumferencie medium excedens, et ita contra naturam ponderositatis sue ascenderet, sic ergo Deus...<sup>16</sup>

The foregoing somewhat garbled account of the seven heavens derives ultimately from ancient rabbinical tradition.<sup>17</sup> It is lore by no means common in western exegesis. As noted I have been unable to find any literary source for it. It seems quite possible, judging by its tone, and by the infirm grasp of Hebrew reflected in it, that it is Gervase's own composition, and that this quasi-Talmudic information came to him by word-of-mouth from one of the considerable Jewish community in 12th century Arles.<sup>18</sup>

Items 2 and 3 provide brief samples of Gervase's rehandling of Justin and Paul the Deacon respectively.

## 2

JUSTIN XII, v, 9, ff.<sup>19</sup>

Inde Drangas, Euergetas vel Ari-maspos, Parapamesadas ceterosque populos, qui in radice Caucasi morabantur, subegit. Interea unus ex amicis Darii Bessus victus perducitur, qui regem non solum prodiderat, verum et interfecerat. Quem in ultionem perfidia excruciandum fratri Darii tradidit, reputans non tam hostem suum fuisse Darium quam amicum eius, a quo esset occisus. Et ut his terris nomen relinqueret, urbem Alexandream super amnem Tanaim condidit, intra diem septimum decimum muro sex milium pas-

## GERVASE

In radice montis Caspii et Caucasi habitant Dranci, Evergete, Parune, Parapammerum, Adaspai, quos Alexander subiugavit, a quibus

<sup>15</sup> Thus Ms. I; X omits *nec descendere*.

<sup>16</sup> For the transliteration of the Hebrew words evidently intended by Gervase I am indebted to Dr. J. Rosenwasser of the Dept. of Oriental Printed Books and Manuscripts of the British Museum.

<sup>17</sup> See *Jewish Encyclopedia* s. v. "Angelology."

<sup>18</sup> In 1160 Benjamin of Tuleda found there a colony of two hundred Isrealites. *Jewish Ency.* s.v. "France".

<sup>19</sup> Ed. Seel, pp. 110-114.

## JUSTIN

## GERVASE

suum consummato, translatus in eam trium civitatum populis, quas Cyrus condiderat. In Bactrianis quoque Sogdianisque xii urbes condidit, distributis his, quoscumque in exercitu seditiosos habebat.

vi His ita gestis sollemni die amicos in convivium convocat, ubi orta inter ebrios rerum a Philippo gestarum mentione praeferre se patri ipse rerumque suarum magnitudinem extollere caelo tenus coepit adsentante maiore convivarum parte. Itaque cum unus e senibus, Clitos, fiducia amicitiae regiae, cuius palmam tenebat, memoriam Philippi tueretur laudaretque eius res gestas, adeo regem offendit, ut telo a satellite raptο eundem in convivio trucidaverit. Qua caede exultans mortuo patrociniū Philippi laudemque paternae militiae obiectabat. Postquam satiatus caede animus conquievit et in irae locum successit aestimatio, modo personam occissi, modo causam occidendi considerans, pigere eum facti coepit; quippe paternas laudes tam iracunde accepisse se quam nec convicia debuisset, amicumque senem et innoxium a se occisum inter epulas et pocula dolebat. Eodem igitur furore in paenitentiam quo pridem in iram versus mori voluit. Primum in fletus progressus amplecti mortuum, vulnera tractare, quasi audienti confiteri dementiam, adreptumque telum in se vertit peregissetque facinus, nisi amici intervenissent. Mansit haec voluntas moriendi etiam sequentibus diebus. Accesserat enim paenitentiae nutricis suae et sororis Cliti recordatio, cuius absentis eum maxime pudebat; tam foedam illi alimentorum suorum mercedem redditam, ut in cuius manibus pueritiam egerat, huic iuvenis et victor pro beneficiis funera remitteret. Reputabat deinde, quantum in exercito suo, quantum apud devictas gentes fabularum atque invidiae, quantum apud ceteros amicos

## JUSTIN

## GERVASE

metum et odium sui fecerit, quam amarum et triste reddiderit convivium suum, non armatus in acie quam in convivio terribilior. Tunc Parmenion et Philotas, tunc Amyntas consobrinus, tunc noverca fratresque interfecti, tunc Atalus, Eurylochos, Pausanias aliique Macedoniae extincti principes occurrerunt. Ob haec illi quadriduo perservata inedia est, donec exercitus universi precibus exoratus est, precantes ne ita morte unius doleat, ut universos perdat, quos in ultimam deductos barbariam inter infestes et inritatas bello gentes destituat. Multum profuere Callisthenis philosophi preces; condiscipulatu apud Aristotelen familiaris illi et tunc ab ipso rege ad prodenda memoriae acta eius accitus. Revocato igitur ad bella animo Chorasmos et Dahas in deditiomen accepit.

vii Dein, quod primo ex Persico superbiae regiae more distulerat ne omnia pariter invidiosiora essent, non salutari, sed adorari se iubet. Acerrimus inter recusantes Callisthenes fuit. Quae res et illi et multis principibus Macedonium exitio fuit, siquidem sub specie insidiarum omnes interfecti. Retentus tamen est a Macedonibus modus salutandi regis explosa adoratione.

Post haec Indiam petit, ut Oceano ultimoque Oriente finiret imperium. Cui gloriae ut etiam exercitus ornamenta convenirent, phaleras equorum et arma militum argento inducit exercitumque suum ab argenteis clipeis Argyraspidas appellavit. Cum ad Nysam urbem venisset, oppidanis non repugnantibus fiducia religionis Liberi patris, a quo condita urbs erat, parci iussit, laetus non militiam tantum, verum et vestigia se dei secutum. Tunc ad spectaculum sacri montis duxit exercitum, naturalibus bonis, vite hederaeque, non aliter vestiti, quam si manu cultes colentiumque industria exornatus esset. Sed exercitus eius, ubi ad mon-

Indiam intravit, ut oceano ultimoque oriente finiret imperium. Cui gloriae ut etiam ornamenta convenirent exercitus faleras equorum et arma argento induit exercitumque suum a clipeis Argiraspidas appellavit. Exhinc ad Nisam urbem venit, a Libero Patre conditam.

Tunc ad spectaculum montis duxit exercitum,

a quo correptus repentino montis (sic)

## JUSTIN

tem accessit, repentino impetu mentis in sacros dei ululatus instinctus cum stupore regis sine noxa discurrit, ut intellexeret non tam oppidanis se parcendo quam exercitui suo consuluisse. Inde montes Daedalos regnaque Cleophridis reginae petit. Quae cum se dedidisset ei, concubitu redemptum regnum ab Alexandro recepit, inlecebris consecuta, quod armis non poterat; filiumque ab eo genitum Alexandrum nominavit, qui postea regno Indorum potitus est. Cleophris regina propter prostratam pudicitiam scortum regium ab Indis exinde appellata est. Peragrata India cum ad saxum mirae asperitatis et altitudinis, in quod multi populi confugerant, pervenisset, cognoscit Herculem ab expugnatione eiusdem saxi terrae motu prohibitum. Captus itaque cupidine Herculis acta superare cum summo labore ac periculo potitus saxo omnes eius loci gentes in deditionem ccepit.

Viii Unus ex regibus Indorum fuit, Porus nomine, viribus corporis et animi, magnitudine pariter insignis, qui bellum iam pridem audita Alexandri opinione, in adventum eius parabat. Commisso itaque proelio exercitum suum Macedonas invadere iubet, sibi regem eorum privatim hostem deposcit. Nec Alexander pugnae moram fecit; sed prima congressione vulnerato equo cum praecipuus ad terram decidisset, concursu satellitum servatur. Porus multis vulneribus obrutus capitur. Qui victum se adeo doluit, ut cum veniam ab hoste accepisset, neque cibum sumere voluerit neque vulnera curari passus sit aegreque sit ab eo obtentum, ut vellet vivere. Quem Alexander ob honorem virtutis incolumem in regnum remisit. Duas ibi urbes conditi; unam Nicaeam, alteram ex nomine equi Bucephalen vocavit. Inde Adrestas, Catheanos, Praesidas, Gangaridas caesis eorum exercitibus expugnat. Cum ad Sophitis

## GERVASE

impetu non tam oppidanis se parcendo quam exercitui consulendo recessit. Inde montes Dedachos regnum Cleofilis Regine petit,

que cum ei se dedisset concubitu illecebris consequitur quod armis non poterat, filiumque ab eo genitum Alexandrum nominavit, qui postea regno Indorum potitus est.

Accedens ad saxum mire celsitudinis et asperitatis, cognoscit Herculem ab expugnatione illius terre fuisse prohibitum. Captus itaque cupidine Herculis acta superare, cum summo labore ac periculo omnes loci illius gentes in deditionem accepit.

Unus ex Indorum regibus Porus fuit,

quem vicit et captum

in regnum restituit, duas ei urbes construens, Niceam et Bucifalam.

Inde Adestas, Geste acies [for Geste-anes?], Praesidas, Gangaridas caesis eorum exercitibus expugnat. Custes vincit.

## JUSTIN

## GERVASE

<regnum> venisset, ubi eum hostium CC milia <peditum et XX milia> equitum opperiebantur, exercitus omnis non minus victoriarum numero quam laboribus fessus lacrimis eum deprecatur, finam tandem bellis faceret; aliquando patriae reditusque meminisset, respiceret militum annos, quibus vix aetas ad reditum sufficeret. Ostendere alius canitiem, alius vulnera, alius aetate consumpta corpora, alius cicatricibus exhausta; solos se esse, qui duorum regum, Philippi Alexandrique, continuam militiam pertulerint. Tantum orare, ut reliquias saltem suas paternis sepulcris reddat, quorum non studiis deficiatur quam annis, ac, si non militibus, vel ipsi sibi parcat, ne fortunam suam nimis onerando fatiget. Motus his tam iustis precibus velut in finem victoriae castra solito magnificentiora fieri iussit, quorum molitionibus et hostis terreretur et posteris admiratio sui relinqueretur. Nullum opus laetius milites fecere. Itaque caesis hostibus cum gratulatione in eadem reverterunt.

ix Inde Alexander ad amnem Acesinem pergit; per hunc in Oceanum devehitur. Ibi Agensonas Sibosque, quos Hercules condidit, in deditionem accipit. Hinc in Ambros et Sugambros navigat, quae gentes eum armatis...

Ad amnem Agysticum pergit, per quem in oceanum devehitur usque Censonas. Afilos Sileosque quos Hercules condidit, in deditionem cepit. Hinc in Andros et Subgambros navigat.

Gervase is here gleaning Justin's history for details regarding India wherewith to enrich his description of that country in *Otia Imperialia* II, 6. Names of places and peoples are evidently his principle harvest. He finds them embedded, however, in a matrix of rather romantic history, and some fragments thereof get carried into a primarily geographical addendum. He cannot quite resist the silvered army, nor the love-affair, but he omits most of the romantic stuff of the original (the slaying of Clitos with accompanying heroics, the self-deification, etc.) as extraneous to geography.



*Hist. Langobard., I, 1-3.*<sup>20</sup>

Septentrionalis plaga quanto magis ab aestu solis remota est et nivali frigore gelida, tanto salubrior corporibus hominum et propagandis est gentibus coaptata sicut e contra omnis meridiana regio, quo solis est fervori vicinior, eo semper morbis habundat et educandis minus est apta mortalibus. Unde fit, ut tantae populorum multitudines arctoo sub axe oriantur, ut non inmerito universa illa regio Tanai tenus usque ad occiduum, licet et propriis loca in ea singula nuncupentur nominibus, generali tamen vocabulo Germania vocetur; quamvis et duas ultra Rhenum provincias, Romani, cum ea loca occupassent, superiorem inferioremque Germaniam dixerint. Ab hac ergo populosa Germania saepe innumerabiles captivorum turmae abductae meridianis populis pretio distrahuntur. Multae quoque ex ea, pro eo quod tantos mortalium germinat, quantos alere vix sufficit, saepe gentes egressae sunt, quae nihilominus et partes Asiae, sed maxime sibi contiguam Europam adflixerunt. Testantur hoc ubique urbes erutae per totam Illiricum Galliamque, sed maxime miserae Italiae, pene omnium illarum est gentium experta saevitiam. Gothi siquidem Wandali, Rugi, Heroli atque Turcilingi, necnon etiam et aliae feroces et barbarae nationes e Germania prodierunt. Pari etiam modo et Winnilorum, hoc est Langobardorum, gens, quae postea in Italia feliciter regnavit, a Germanorum populis originem ducens, licet et aliae causae egressionis eorum asseverentur, ab insula quae Scadinavia dicitur adventavit.

2. Cuius insulae etiam Plinius Secundus in libris, quos de natura rerum composuit, mentionem facit. Haec igitur

GERVASE

Dicitur autem, ut prenotavi, Germania a germinando, siquidem septentrionalis plaga, quanto magis ab estu solis remota est et nivali frigore gelida tanto celebrior corporibus hominum, et procreandis gentibus est coaptata.

Unde fit ut tanta populorum multitudo arctoo sub axe oriatur, ut non immerito universa illa regio Germania vocetur.

Sunt ergo due Germanie, Superior et Inferior;

qui tantos mortalium germinant quantos vix alere sufficiunt e quibus egressae sunt gentes quae nihilominus et partes Asiae, sed maxime sibi contiguam Europam adflixerunt. Gothi

siquidem et Wandali, Rigi, et Eruli atque Turgiltugi, necnon et alie feroces gentes a Germania prodierunt. Pari etiam modo et Hynnulorum, gens ferocissima

ab insula Scatanavia prodiit,

quae insula non tam in mari posita est quam marinis fluctibus propter planitiem marginum<sup>21</sup> terrarum ruentibus

<sup>20</sup> Ed. Waitz, pp. 47-49.

<sup>21</sup> Thus MS X; 1 marinum.

## PAUL

insula, sicut retulerunt nobis qui eam lustraverunt, non tam in mari est posita, quam marinis fluctibus propter planitiem marginum terras ambientibus circumfusa. Intra hanc ergo constituti populi dum in tantam multitudinem pululassent, ut iam simul habitare non valerent, in tres, ut fertur, omnem catervam partes dividentes, quae ex illis pars patriam relinquere novasque deberet sedes exquirere, sorte perquirunt. 3. Igitur ea pars, cui sors dederat genitale solum excedere exteraque arva secari, ordinatis super se duobus ducibus, Ibor scilicet et Aionem, qui et germani erant et inveniti aetate floridi et ceteris praestantiores, ad exquirendas quas possint incolere terras sedesque statuere, valedicentes suis simul et patriae, iter arripiunt. Horum erat ducum mater nomine Gambara, mulier quantum inter suos et ingenio acris et consiliis provida; de cuius in rebus dubiis prudentia non minimum confidebant.

## GERVASE

circumfusa. Huius modi insule populi dum iam simul habitare non<sup>22</sup> valerent, in tres partes omnem catervam<sup>23</sup> dividerunt qui ex illis patrium relinquere novasque deberet sedes requirere, sorte requirunt. Igitur pars cui sors dederat duos habuit duces, Ybor et Agionem.

cum matre Gambara<sup>24</sup> prudentissima. Nunc ad cepta redeamus.

Gervase has here simply and rather skillfully condensed his original, itself more descriptive than narrative. The first-personal verb of his final sentence is, of course, significant.

## 4

A passage 350 words long, beginning: Porro de strenuitate Gallorum ac processu ex *Epithomate* Justini super libros Pompei Trogii annexui, and ending: Ex gente Tectasgorum non mediocris populus prede dulcedine Illiricum repetivit, spoliatisque Histris, in Pannonia consedit, is mainly composed of nine passages copied, but not in the order of the original, from Justin.<sup>25</sup> The information regarding the Gauls that

<sup>22</sup> Thus MS X; I habitare valerent.

<sup>23</sup> Thus X; I terram.

<sup>24</sup> Thus X; I Gabarup.

<sup>25</sup> Seel p. 195, ll. 8 (Namque Galli abundante...) - 24 (...ingenti pecunia mercarentur); p. 202, l. 21 (Quamquam Gallorum ea tempestate...) - p. 203, l. 1 (...Gallica virtute arbitrarentur); p. 202, ll. 18 (tantaque caedes Gallorum...) - 20 (...a finitimorum feritate praestiterit.); p. 203, ll. 1 (Itaque in auxilium...) - 4 (...regionem Gallogreciam cognominaverunt); p. 236,

Gervase has here gathered includes the accounts of their leaving their native land to overflow into Italy, Illyria, Pannonia, Greece, and Macedonia, the spread of their terrible fame, of depredations committed by them on certain temples, and of their consequent debacle in an earthquake on Mount Parnassus. Gervase has given his borrowed history something of a moral « curve » rising to the point of the sacrilege, and falling abruptly thereafter. Again he speaks in the first person.

## 5

A passage of about 295 words, beginning: *Tempore huius Iustiniani Decii*, and ending: *sub quo arma precipuo fabricata dicuntur*, is a free paraphrase of Paul's *Historia* I, 22-27.<sup>26</sup> As the following parallel passages will indicate, the color and detail of the *Historia* is at times lost in Gervase's compression of it.

*Hist. Langobard.*, I, 23-24.<sup>27</sup>

GERVASE

Gepidi igitur ac Langobardi conceptam iam dudum rixam tandem parturiunt, bellumque ab utrisque partibus praeparatur. Commisso itaque proelio, dum ambae acies fortiter dimicarent et neutra alteri cederet, contigit, ut in ipso certamine Alboin, filius Audoin, et Turismodus, Turisindi filius, sibi obvii fierent. Quem Alboin spata percutiens, de equo praecipitatum extinxit. Cernentes Gepidi, regis filium, per quem magna ex parte bellum constiterat, interisse, mox dissolutis animis fugam iniunt. Quos Langobardi insequentes acriter sternunt. Caesisque quam plurimis, ad detrahenda occisorum spolia revertuntur. Cumque peracta Langobardi victoria ad sedes proprias remeassent, regi suo Audoin suggerunt, ut eius Alboin conviva fieret, cuius virtute

*Tempore huius Iustiniani Decii*, rex Longobardorum, Aldoinus, Longobardos in Pannoniam duxit, qui victis Gepidis cum Alboinus filius eius Turismundum Turisindis regis eorum filium stra-

ll. 14 (Namque Galli bello...) - 17 (... in Thraciam extorres fugerant); p. 197, ll. 14 (Macedoniae agros depraedatur...) - 17 (... largiri hominibus oportere); l. 21 (Templum autem Apollinis...) - p. 198, l. 11 (... consulentibus dare cogit); p. 200, ll. 8 (Praesentiam dei et ipsi...) - 15 (... pugione vitam finivit); p. 236, l. 17 (Inde per eadem vestigia...) - p. 237, l. 3 (... in Pannonia consedit).

<sup>26</sup> Waitz, p. 60, l. 12; p. 61, l. 9 - p. 63, l. 1; p. 63, ll. 10-12, l. 15 - p. 64, l. 2; p. 69 passim; p. 70, ll. 1-5.

<sup>27</sup> Waitz, pp. 61-2.

## PAUL

in proelio victoriam cepissent; ut, qui patri in periculo, ita et in convivio comes esset. Quibus Audoin respondit, se hoc facere minime posse, ne ritum gentis infringeret. 'Scitis', inquit, 'non esse apud nos consuetudinem, ut regis cum patre filius prandeat, nisi prius a rege gentis exteræ arma suscipiat.'

24. His Alboin a patre auditis, quadraginta solummodo secum iuvenes tollens, ad Turisindum, cum quo dudum bellum gesserat, regem Gepidorum, profectus est, causamque qua venerat intimavit. Qui eum benigne suscipiens ad suum convivium invitavit, atque ad suam dexteram, ubi Turismodus, eius quondam filius, sedere consueverat, collocavit. Inter hæc dum varii apparatus epulas caperent, Turisindus iam dudum sessionem filii mente revolvens natique funus ad animum reducens præsentemque peremptorem eius loco resedere conspiciens, alta trahens suspiria, sese continere non potuit, sed tandem dolor in voce erupit: 'Amabilis', inquit, 'mihi locus iste est, sed persona quæ in eo residet satis ad videndum gravis.' Tunc regis alter qui aderat filius, patris sermone stimulatus, Langobardos iniuriis lacessere coepit, asserens eos, quia a suris inferius candidis utebantur fasciis, equabus quibus crure tenus pedes albi sunt similes esse, dicens: 'Fetilæ sunt equæ, quas similatis.' Tunc unus e Langobardis ad hæc ita respondit: 'Perge,' ait, 'in campum Asfeld, ibique procul dubio poteris experiri, quam valide istæ quas equas nominas prævalent calcitrare; ubi sic tui dispersa sunt ossa germani quemadmodum vilis iumentum in mediis pratis.' His auditis, Gepidi confusionem ferre non valentes vehementer in ira commoti sunt manifestasque iniurias vindicare nituntur; Langobardi econtra parati ad bellum omnes ad gladium capulos manus iniciunt. Tunc rex a mensa prosiliens, sese in medium obiecit suosque ab ira

## GERVASE

visset, propter quod Aldoino suggeritur ut filium suum in convivio iuxta se collocaret, respondit non esse apud eos consuetum regis filium cum patre prandere nisi prius a rege gentis exteræ arma suscipiat.

Quibus Alboinus auditis ad Turisindum accessit et in convivio cum eo sedens, in loco filii regis quem occiderat.

Audivit a patre inter epulas, "Amabilis michi locus est iste, sed persona sedens in eo satis ad videndum gravis."

Unde moti Geppidi in eum irruunt.

## PAUL

## CERVASE

belloque conpescuit, interminans primitus eum puniri, qui primus pugnam commisisset; non esse victoriam Deo placitam, dicens, cum quis in domo propria hospitem perimit. Sic denique iurgio conpresse, iam deinceps laetis animis convivium peragunt. Sumensque Turisindus arma Turismodi filii sui, ea Alboin tradidit, eumque cum pace incolonem ad patris regnum remisit. Reversus ad patrem Alboin, eius dehinc conviva effectus est. Qui dum eum patre laetus regias delicias caperet, ordine cuncta retulit, quae illi aput Gepidos in Turismodi regia contigissent. Mirantur quid aderant et laudant audaciam Alboin, nec minus adtollunt laudibus Turisindi maximam fidem.

Sed rex hoc fieri acriter prohibens ait, "Non esse victoriam Deo placitam cum quis in domo propria hospitem perimit." Sicque redeunte grata leticia, finito convivio, Turisindus filii sui arma Alboindo dedit.

Qui ad patrem Aldoinum redditus, eius convivia effectum.

O, maxima fides hospitis !

## 6

A passage of 134 words, also from Paul's *Historia* begins : Cum cartularius imperialis Ytalie preerat and concludes: Hoc breviter de gestis diximus. It is composed of items of information, gleaned here and there in the first eight chapters of Book II of Paul's *Historia*:<sup>28</sup> brief reference to Narsis, "cartularius imperialis," the slanders regarding his loyalty to Rome, the invasion, at his invitation, of Italy by the Lombards and Saxons, the entrance into Italy of Albion in 564, via the highest mountain of the Alps, Mons Regis, "in quo bisontes animalia occisa sunt quorum corium sic amplum erat ut xv homines seriatim in eo cubare possent."

## 7

A passage 123 words long, beginning: Quo mortuo dividitur, and ending: totis elimosinis, et caritati datus et expositus recounts in barest outline some of the events described by Paul in II, 4-15 of the *Historia*,<sup>29</sup> with such selection, free paraphrase and rearrangement as to constitute essentially "original" composition. A sentence in this item enables us

<sup>28</sup> Waitz, p. 72, ll. 20, 24-27; p. 73, ll. 10-13; p. 75, ll. 1-7; p. 76 l. 1; p. 77, l. 2.

<sup>29</sup> Waitz, p. 94, ll. 17-18, 22-24; p. 95, ll. 9-10; p. 96, ll. 4-6, 21-25; p. 98, l. 18-p. 99, l. 10; p. 100, ll. 21-23.

to identify with reasonable confidence the manuscript of Paul's *Historia* utilized by Gervase:

Inde Avinionem et Aurasicam, Vacionem et Vapincum cuius presul ad modo vicum montem inexpugnabilem fugit et Arelatem capiunt usque ad campum Lapidosum urbe eversa.

This sentence is obviously based upon the following passage:

quorum nomina hec sunt: Avinion, Arausica, Vasion, Vapincum. De presule ipsius urbis. Sub ipso tempore urbem hanc et ecclesiam nobiliter et strenue regebat insignis presul Pancracius nomine. Qui cum cerneret, se nequaquam hostibus resistere posse, aliquandiu obsidionem perferens, dehinc ad montem tutissimum, qui inexpugnabilem obtinebat munitionem, in sua diocesim positum, nomine Vodoliensem, cum omnibus que habere poterat, imminens exicium declinans, secessit. Et Amo quidem obsidionem predictae urbis parans, ab eo capta atque a fundamentis eversa, omnesque qui in ea reperti sunt, quoniam se sponte tradere noluerunt, gladio sunt perempti. Dehinc universa, vicos, urbes vel castella, que reperire poterat, usque ad ipsum Lapideum campum...<sup>30</sup>

And this passage, according to Waitz, is found only in MS 13, i.e. Parisiensis M. 5315, "olim ut videtur Arelatensis."

## 8

Item 8, a passage 270 words long, is derived, as the opening sentence indicates, from the *Epistola Alexandri ad Aristotelem*.<sup>31</sup> It ends, "Vivit CCC annis," and is in effect composed of seven brief passages taken with minor verbal changes from that work. The version used by Gervase appears, as will presently be shown, to have belonged to MS families I or II as established in W. Walther Boer's critical edition of the *Epistola*.<sup>32</sup> Gervase's 270 words are excerpted from a passage about 2000 words long in the source. They represent a concentration on the marvels encountered by Alexander on his march, omitting details, and omitting the conqueror's report of his own emotions. A portion of item 8 juxtaposed with the correspondent passage in the *Epistola* will serve to illustrate.

<sup>30</sup> Waitz, p. 96, ll. 21-30.

<sup>31</sup> Magoun's *Epistola* I.

<sup>32</sup> I have, described Gervase's borrowings from the *Epistola* with reference to Rypin's edition of MS C.C.C. Oxon. 82 rather than to Walther Boer's critical edition because the former is more generally available and serves quite as well to indicate the contents of Gervase's excerpts.

## RYPINS

## GERVASE

Tum itinere sumpto agmen sub signis ducente me duo senes facti sunt nobis obviam. Quos cum interrogarem numquid nossent in illa regione dignum aliquid ad spectaculum responderunt michi esse viam .x. non amplius dierum per quam difficilis tamen esset ascensus propter aquae penuriam proque tantis impedimentis si cum universo pergere vellem exercitu. Ceterum si commcatus .xl. <sup>ta</sup> milia hominum proponerem propter itinerum angustas semitas et bestiosa satis loca posse contingere mihi ut aliquid incredibile perspicerem. Tum ego laetus factus eos mulcens dicite inquam mihi quid sit istud quod michi illustre et tam magnificum pollicemini. Tum viri exhylarati blanda mea voce videbis inquit rex quicumque es duas solis et lunae arbores indice et grece loquentes. Quarum unum virile robur est solis alterum femininum est lunae et ab his quae tibi instant bona aut mala nosse poteris. Qua re tam incredibili illudi me a barbaris senibus existimans pena eos inpingi et aliqua contumelia iussi notare illos dicens. Itane eo maiestas mea pervenit ab occidente usque ad orientem ut a senibus barbaris ac decrepitis illudi posse videar quibus iurantibus se nichil posse falsi comminisci experire me modo posse an vera dicerent operiendum in brevi putavi non esse vanum. Orantibus quoque amicis comitibus ne tantae rei experimento fraudarentur xxx. <sup>ta</sup> milia mecum equitatus traxi remissis in fasiacen copiis cum quibusdam praefectis exercituque cuncto elephantis et rege poro et impedimentis omnibus mox lecto robore iuventutis admirabilia visuri spectacula ducentibus indorum senibus qui nos ut dixerunt per inania et egentia plerumque aquarum per aliqua serpentium ferarumque loca deduxerunt in proximam oraculi sedem. De quibus feris et serpentibus quia innumerae et indica lingua vocitatae erant scriben-

In *Epistola Alexandri ad Aristotelem* ita legitur: Profecto ad oceanum in regionem Ethiopiam, accepi ab incolis esse duas arbores, solis et lune, quarum una robur virile, altera femininum habet, et a his quae instant bona vel mala nosse poteris.

## RYPINS

dum tibi non putavi. Cum appropinquaremus regionem a nobis petitam vidimus feminas virosque aliquos aliquos (sic) pantherarum tygridumque pellibus contextos. A quibus cum quereremus quinam hominum essent indos se esse sua lingua dicebant. Locus autem erat largus thure et oppobalsamo immenso habundabat quae plurima ramis eorum innascebantur nemorum et vesci incolae eius regionis consueverant. Et cum sacrarium... pp. 93, l. 6-94, l. 8.

## GERVASE

Cum ad dictam regionem appropinquaremus, vidimus feminas virosque pantherarum tigrisumque pellibus contextos, qui se Indos esse Indica lingua dixerunt. Locus autem erat largus, mirra et balsamo habundans quae plurima ramis arborum innascebantur quibus vesce incole solebant.<sup>33</sup>

In addition to the two passages quoted, item 8 is composed of Rypins p. 95, ll. 4 (illas autem arbores...) - 7 (... suorum statu tumentes); ll. 13 (Utraque lingua solis...) - 18 (... nemo palam pronuntiet); ll. 23 (Cogitabam sidevicto...) - 28 (... de capito tuo statuerunt); p. 96, ll. 9 (Consulto igitur...) - 13 (... nemine speras decipieris); ll. 21 (Postero die...) - p. 97, l. 2 (... annis fere .ccc.tis.).

Items 9-16 are incorporated in the Leibnitz text of the *Otia Imperialia*, where they appear as III, 106 (part) and 127-132. Two remarks addressed to Otto<sup>34</sup> in item 9 indicate clearly that it is of Gervase's own composition: Speaking of the Count of St. Egidius, Gervase says: Hic ab illustrissimo rege Anglorum Henrico Vetusto, avo vestro, Imperator Sacratissimi, nec non insignissimo... And in pointing the moral of the same nobleman's miraculous reconversion, he writes: Ecce, Princeps Sacratissime, quanta cauthella bono Christiano est necessaria... Items 10-16 deal with relatively local marvels, and there seems no reason to doubt that these are described in the author's own words.

## 17

In item 17 Gervase has again had recourse to the *Epistola*. A passage of 96 words, it is entitled *De Calice, Aqua, et Arundinibus*, and begins: In libro de situ Indie et gentibus hominum et ferarum ita legitur,<sup>35</sup> and

<sup>33</sup> Worth noting at this point is the use of the second person, *poteris*, at the end of the first sentence excerpted by Gervase, for it would seem to be as inappropriate to any use Gervase might make of it in the *Otia Imperialia* as it is appropriate in the context from which it is drawn. This and other details which will be noted suggest at least that here we have matter not for direct incorporation, but notes for later recasting.

<sup>34</sup> To whom the *Otia* is addressed.

<sup>35</sup> Thus MSS X and W; I In libro de situ Indie et hominibus horum et ferarum ita legitur...



ends: *edificia conficienda utebantur*. It consists of an account, taken almost verbatim from the *Epistola*, of how, with the army in great thirst, the soldier Zefirus found water in a hollow rock and carried it to Alexander in his helmet, who magnanimously: *ne me bibente magis sitire milites inciperent*, poured it out upon the ground; and of 60-foot reeds, thicker in trunk than pine and fir. (Rypins p. 83, ll. 6 (*accidit nobis...*) - 16 (... *ad conficienda aedificia utebantur*.)

## 18

Item 18 is entitled *De Ypotamis*. It begins: *Secundum mecum erant qui aurum*, and tells of Alexander's march along the banks of a salt (?) river, of his arrival opposite an inhabited island to which he sent a detachment of swimming soldiers who were devoured by hippopotamuses. Its 100 words are taken, with minor changes, from the *Epistola*; Rypins p. 83, ll. 22 (*Quippe mecum...*) - 27 (... *circiter duo milia*); p. 84, ll. 14 (*Ripam igitur...*) - 19 (... *culmina delituerunt*); ll. 23 (*ducentos milites...*) - 28 (... *flentibus nobis absumpserunt*); p. 85, ll. 2 (*Sed maior decuplicato...*) - 3 (... *prius adfuit*). From Gervase's excerpts, however, both the motive (search for fresh water) of sending the swimmers, and the condign punishment of the treacherous guide are omitted. His interest is clearly in the man-eating monsters as "marvel." In consequence, his last sentence, sufficiently meaningful in the context of the original, is relatively pointless, indicating again matter destined for revision prior to incorporation into the *Otia*.

## RYPINS

...ducentos milites ex macedonibus levibus armis misi per amnem nataturos. Iamque quartam partem fluminis enataverant cum horrida res visu subito nobis conspecta est maiores elephantorum corporum hyppotami inter profundos aquarum emersi apparuerunt gurgites raptosque in verticem crudeli pena viros flentibus nobis absumpserunt. Iratus ego ducibus qui nos in insidias deduxerunt centum in flumen mitti iussi. Quibus propulsis natantes inviti rursus hyppotami dignos iustaque pena affecere. Sed maior decuplicato numerus beluarum quam prius adfuit...

## GERVASE

In flumen milites cc misi, qui cum quartam partem fluminis enatassent, maiores et elephantorum corporibus ypotami inter profundos aquarum gurgites emersi apparuerunt, raptosque in verticem crudeli pena viros flentibus nobis absumpserunt. De hinc maior decuplicato belluarum numerus affuit.

## 19

Item 19, entitled *De Scorpionibus*, is a passage 200 words long, comprising extracts from a 720 word section of the *Epistola*. Rypins p. 85, ll. 7 (Igitur ab hora...) - 9 (... pretervehi naviculis); p. 86, ll. 6 (ad primos lunae radiantis...) - 8 (... innumeri confligere); ll. 11 (Nam quaedam rubentibus...) - 12 (... quaedam auri); p. 87, ll. 3 (ad horam...) - 4 (... columnnis grossitudine); ll. 6 (quorum pectora...) - 8 (...erat pestifer); ll. 12 (Post discessum...) - 14 (... castra venerunt); l. 17 (Sed adfuere-comparandi); ll. 21 (nec minus apri...) - p. 88, l. 4 (...atri coloris); ll. 8 (Ante lucanum...) - 12 (... statim expirabant); ll. 13 (Appropinquante luce...) - 15 (... pedibus nigris); p. 89, ll. 3 (Relictis periculosis...) - 5 (... oppulenta pervenimus). It begins: Dum ad stagnum dulcis aque pervenissem, and ends: divitiisque opulenta devenimus. From an account in the *Epistola* of how Alexander's army made camp by a pond of fresh water, and how it was beset by successive waves of wild beasts and monsters — scorpions of various colors, plumed serpents, crabs, white lions as large as bulls, boars, spotted lynxes, tigers, panthers, bats as big as doves, etc., etc. — and of the army's stratagems in repulsing them, Gervase extracts the monsters, and omits the strategy. Item 19 also seems destined for the third, i.e. the marvelous, book.

## 20

Item 20, entitled *De Miranda Belua Maris Indici*, is a passage of 136 words-beginning: Victo federatoque Poro, ab eo ad Herculis Liberique trophea deductus sum, and ending: ... sues, quorum gremitus timere bestias noveram. It too is derived from the *Epistola*. Rypins p. 90, ll. 5 (ad Herculis...) - 9 (... victimis placavi); 12 (Pergebam tamen...) - 18 (... sinistram partem indie); 20 (palus erat sicca...) - 24 (... milites ictu occidit); 26 (pervenimus deinde...) - 27 (...ultimas. Ubi...); 31 (venire sivilis...) - p. 91, l. 3 (... bestias noveram.) It recounts, with omission of non-essentials, Aristotle's visit and sacrifice to the statues of Herculis and Liber "in orientis ultimis horis"; his pious decision not to circumnavigate the globe, because they had not dared do so ("prestantissimis deis ergo maiorem me simule videri nolens"); and his routing a herd of elephants attacking his camp by use of cavalry, armed, so to speak, with grunting pigs, "quorum gremitus timere bestias noveram." Gervase in this item preserves all of the incidents of his original, and the first-personal, narrative frame. The focus of his interest, however, and the destination in the third Book of the *Otia* of the matter of item 20 are clear in the title.

## 21

A passage 66 words long, item 21 is entitled *De Iociofagis* [Ichthyophagis] et *Cinofalis* [Cyncephalis]. It begins: *Primo deinde aurore*, and ends: *ad occidentem signa converti*. It follows very closely the account in the *Epistola* of Alexander's encountering and putting to flight marvelous monsters. Cf. Rypins p. 91, ll. 18 (*primum...*) - 29 (*... signa converti imperavi.*) But again, the excerptor's interest is obviously in the monsters, not in the events. He reports the "fact" of the Cynocephali, "*Cinofalis (sic) ingentibus plena deinde loca reperimus,*" but not as in the *Epistola*, their attack and flight: "*Deinde cenophalis ingentibus plena invenimus nemora qui nos lacessere temptabant et ictus sagittarum fugiebant.*"

## 22 and 23

These two items, respectively 59 and 44 words in length, are entitled *De Valle Jordia et Eius Lapidibus*, and *De Griffis et Aliis Bestiis*. Item 22 begins: *Pervenimus deinde*, and ends: *militique morsibus depereunt*. Item 23 begins: *Per magna deinde pericula*, and ends: *leonibus non dissimiles*. The two are equivalent almost verbatim to a continuous brief passage in the *Epistola*. Rypins p. 97, l. 31 (*Pervenimus deinde...*) - p. 98, l. 11 (*... parte corporis disismili*), an account of the jeweled serpents "in vallem Diardinis," nourished on assafoetida and white pepper, of the pyramids which make the valley inaccessible, of the annual battle among them whereby "*multis morsibus depereunt,*" of the lion-headed beasts, with double-clawed tails, and of griffins.

## 24

A passage 336 words long, entitled *De Arundinibus et Spongiis et Piscibus*, begins: *Inde ad Adman flumen venimus*, and ends: *Liberi et Herculis trophea*. It derives from a passage of the *Epistola*, closely succeeding that from which 22 and 23 are taken, and although there has been considerable corruption of the texts at this point, evidently it copies the original save for omission of a few sentences, and for minor rephrasing. Rypins p. 98, ll. 17 (*Inde ad oculus flumen...*) - 21 (*... potentissimo euro vidimus*); 25 (*Inhabitant littus ulterius...*) - 29 (*... marinorum pellibus factas*); 30 (*Item vermes ex ipso flumine..*) - p. 99, l. 10 (*... erant admirabilia portenta.*) At this point MS I preserves a brief passage omitted in MS C.C.C. oxon. 82, and apparently also from the third and

fourth of Walther Boer's four manuscript-families: "Inde ad seres que gens justissima omnium gentium esse perhibetur. Ubi nec adulterium nec perjurium nec ebrietas comitti dicitur. Pane tantum modo et oleribus et aqua viscuntur, qui nos optimis com meatibus suscipientes, recto itinere per Caspiae portas... Rypins p. 99, l. 15 (recte deducentes ire...) - 27 (... liberi et ferculis throphea). It tells of river-reeds which thirty men could hardly carry, of fur-clad "Indi," who offered white and purple sponges, nine-gallon snail-shells and soft, seal-skin tunics, of worms bigger than a man's thigh, and better to eat than the best fish, of enormous red mushrooms, of hirsute and subfluvial females who drew unsuspecting male swimmers down whirlpools, or in among reeds, where they rent them apart in the fury of their passion or "veneris exanimabant voluptate," of beasts with sword-like horns, and of Alexander's ordering two gold pillars, inscribed with all his deeds, to be erected "in ultima India," beyond the monuments of Liber and Hercules.

## 25

Item 25 is entitled *De Signis in Morte Alexandri*. It is a paraphrase of a passage in the *Epitome* of Julius Valerius. It was doubtless destined for Book III of the *Otia*, where occurs the account referred to of the signs portending the death of Caesar.

JULIUS VALERIUS III, 30.<sup>36</sup>

## GERVASE

Cumque inde proficisci disponderet contigit, ut quaedam mulier infantem pareret, cuius superior pars, ad hominem pertinens, iam quidem putrefacta ac semiviva videbatur, inferior vero belluinis capitibus, qualem Scyllam ferunt fabulae poetarum; praeter quod non caninis lupinisve, enimvero leonum et pardorum, ursorumque atque draconum capitibus inguina infantuli cingebantur. Quod ubi Alexandro intimatum est, protinus mulierem advenire iussit partumque monstrare. Adveniens illa nudavit infantem, monstrumque ostendens professa est se peperisse. Rex autem confestim prodigiorum interprete arcesso sciscitabatur, quidnam hoc

Memine pridem me scripsisse signa que in morte Julii Caesaris apparuerunt et que in morte Alexandri mater Olimpias per quietem vidit<sup>37</sup> supra notavimus, signa mortis eius annectenda judicavi. Cum igitur Babylone in potestate sua redacta Inde proficisci disponderet, contigit ut quaedam mulier infantem pareret, cuius superior pars ad hominem pertinens iam putrefacta ac semiviva videbatur, inferior belluinis capitibus qualem Scyllam ferunt fabulae poetarum, preterquam quod non lupinis aut caninis enimvero leonum ursorum pardorumve atque draconum capitibus inguina infantuli cingebantur. Quod cum Alexandro ostensum esset

<sup>36</sup> Ed. Zacher, pp. 61-2.

<sup>37</sup> Thus MSS W, X, and a. I reads: ... apparuerunt et quia mortu Alexandri mater per quietem supra...

## VALERIUS

portenderet. Qui mox secreto respondit regi dicens: "O rex! o utinam interpretatio hostibus et inimicis tuis haec esset! Superior quippe pars, quae ad hominem pertinet, quaeque iam putrida ac semiviva videtur, te significat, domine rex; in promptu quoque est, ut tu moriaris atque intereas. Inferior vero pars, quae ferinis capitibus cingitur, quaeque vivere videtur, hi sunt principes tibi subiecti. Et ut hae ferae inter se dissident, sic quoque post mortem tuam hi inter se discordes erunt." Haec interpretatio non modicam Alexandro moestitiam intulit.

## GERVASE

acersito prodigiorum interprete sic expositum est: "Superior pars signat quod in promptu est ut moriaris; inferior pars principes tuos inter se post mortem tuam discordes ostendit."

## 26

Item 26 is an account of the portents presaging the death of Charlemagne, and like 25, was intended for Book III. It follows closely, as the following juxtaposition shows, its source in Einhard. The pious opening sentence accords with the admonitory tone which Gervase assumes repeatedly in the *Otia*.

EINHARD 32<sup>38</sup>

Adpropinquantis finis conplura fuere prodigia, ut non solum alii, sed etiam ipse hoc minitari sentiret. Per tres continuos vitaeque termino proximos annos et solis et lunae creberrima defectio et in sole macula quaedam atrii coloris septem dierum spatio visa. Porticus, quam inter basilicam et regiam operosa mole construxerat, die ascensionis Domini subita ruina usque ad fundamenta conlapsa. Item pons Rheni apud Montiacum, quem ipse per decem annos ingenti labore et opere mirabili de ligno ita construxit ut perenniter durare posse videretur, ita tribus horis fortuitu incendio conflagravit ut, prater quod aqua tegabatur, ne una quidem hastula ex eo remaneret. Ipse quoque, cum ultimam in Saxoniam expeditionem

## GERVASE

Nunc quedam signa que ante mortem excellentissimi Regis Caroli Magni apparuerunt annectamus ut acuatur pia fides principum ad timenda iudicia Dei, que sunt abbas multa. Per tres ergo annos morti proximos visa est solis et lune creberrima eclipsus et in sole macula atrii coloris visa septem dierum spatio. Porticus inter basilicam et regiam Aquis Grani ab ipso operosa mole constructa, die Ascensionis Domini subita ruina usque ad fundamenta collapsa. Pons Rheni apud Maguntiam per x annos ingenti labore et opere mirabili de lignis constructus, ut perhennis videretur, ita iiii horis fortuitu incendio conflagravit quod preter id quod aqua tegebatur ne quidem una haustula remanet. Ipse quidem, cum in Saxoniam

<sup>38</sup> Ed. Garrod and Mowat, pp. 32-4.

## EINHARD

contra Godofridum regem Danorum ageret, quadam die, cum ante exortum solis castris egressus iter agere coepisset, vidit repente delapsam caelitus cum ingenti lumine facem a dextra in sinistram per serenum aera transcurrere. Cunctisque hoc signum quid portenderet admirantibus, subito equus quem sedebat capite deorsum merso decidit eumque tam graviter ad terram elisit ut, fibula sagi rupta balteoque gladii dissipato, a festinantibus qui aderant ministris exarmatus et sine amiculo levaretur. Iaculum etiam, quod tunc forte manu tenebat, ita elapsum est ut viginti vel eo amplius pedum spatio longe iaceret. Accessit ad hoc creber Aquensis palatii tremor et in domibus ubi conversabatur assiduus laqueariorum crepitus. Tacta etiam de caelo, in qua postea sepultus est, basilica, malumque aureum, quo tecti culmen erat ornatum, ictu fulminis dissipatum et supra domum pontificis, quae basilicae contigua erat, proiectum est. Erat in eadem basilica in margine coronae, quae inter superiores et inferiores arcus interiorem aedis partem ambiebat, epigramma sinopide scriptum, continens quis auctor esset eiusdem templi, cuius in extremo versu legebatur: KAROLUS PRINCEPS. Notatum est a quibusdam eodem quo decessit anno paucis ante mortem mensibus cas quae PRINCEPS exprimebant litteras ita esse deletas ut penitus non apparerent.

Items 27-29, being brief, may be presented along with their source passages in the *Historia Langobardorum*.

## 27

## PAULUS

In extremis circium versus Germaniae finibus, in ipso oceani littore, antrum sub eminenti rupe conspicitur, ubi septem viri, incertum ex quo tem-

## GERVASE

ultimam ageret expeditionem contra Godefridum regem Danorum, castris egressus, vidit repente delapsam celitus cum ingenti lumine facem a dextra ad sinistram per serenum aeris transmissam cunctisque admirantibus subito Karolus equo delapsus capite equi deorsum verso, ut fibula sagi rupta, balteoque gladii dissipato, vix a circumstantibus exanimis levatur. Iaculum quod forte tunc manu gestabat xx ampliusque pedum spatio prosiliit. Accessit ad hec creber palatii Aquensis tremor et in domibus ubi morabatur laquearium frequens crepitus malumque aureum, quod culmen tecti tenebat, ictu fulminis dissipatur. Et supra contiguam pontificis domum perhibetur epigramma continens litteras constructoris basilice, cuius finis erat *Carolus Princeps*, paucis ante mortem eius mensibus penitus in sua integritate manentibus (sic).

## GERVASE

*De vii Dormientibus in Germania*

In extremis Germanie finibus circium versus in ipso oceani littore antrum sub eminenti rupe conspicitur ubi septem, nescitur a quo tempore, requies-

## PAULUS

pore longo sopiti sopore quiescunt, ita inlaesis non solum corporibus, sed etiam vestimentis, ut ex hoc ipso, quod sine ulla per tot annorum curricula corruptione perdurant, apud indociles easdem et barbaras nationes veneratione habentur. Hi denique, quantum ad habitum spectat Romani esse cernuntur. E quibus dum unum quidam cupiditate stimulatus vellet exuere, mox eius ut dicitur, brachia aruerunt, poenaeque sua ceteros perterritum ne quis eos ulterius contingere auderet.

Waitz, p. 49, ll. 12-19.

## GERVASE

cunt dormientes, non solum corporibus sed etiam vestibus incorruptis; und cuiusdam eos exuere intentis brachia aruerunt.

## 28

*De Scriptobonis et Umbra Hominis*

Huic loco Scritobini — sic enim gens illa nominatur — vicini sunt. Qui etiam aestatis tempore nivibus non carent, nec aliud, utpote feris ipsis ratione non dispares, quam crudis agrestium animalium carnibus vescuntur; de quorum etiam hirtis pellibus sibi indumenta peraptant. Hi a saliendo iuxta linguam barbaram ethimologiam ducunt. Saltibus enim utentes, arte quadam ligno incurvo ad arcus similitudinem feras adsecuntur. Aput hos est animal cervo non satis absimile de cuius ego corio, ut fuerat pilis hispidum, vestem in modum tunicae genu tenus aptatam conspexi, sicut iam fati, ut relatum est, Scritobini utuntur. Quibus in locis circa aestivale solstitium per aliquod dies etiam noctu clarissima lux cernitur, diesque ibi multo maiores quam alibi habentur; sicut e contrario circa brumale solstitium quamvis diei lux adsit, sol tamen non ibi videtur, diesque minimi, quam usquam alibi, noctes quoque longiores existunt; quia scilicet, quanto magis a sole longius disceditur, tanto sol ipse terrae vicinior apparet et umbrae longiores excrescunt. Denique in Italia, sicut et antequam scripserunt, circa diem natalis Domini novem pedes in umbra staturae

Huic sane loco Scriptoboni vicini sunt, apud quos nix perpetua;

ubi in solisticio brumali nulla dies, et in estivali nulla nox videatur et umbra meridiana hora longissima.

Sic in Ytalia circa diem Natalis Domini novem pedes in hora sexta umbram

## PAULUS

humanae hora sexta metiuntur. Eg<sup>o</sup> autem in Gallia Belgica in loco qui Totionis villa dicitur constitutus, stans atque me umbram metiens, decem et novem et semis pedes inveni. Sic quoque contrario modo, quanto propinquius meridiem versus ad solem acceditur, tantum semper umbrae breviores videntur, in tantum ut solstitio aestivali, respiciente sole de medio caeli, in Aegypto et Hierosolimis et in eorum vicinitate constitutis locis nullae videantur umbrae. In Arabia vero hoc ipso tempore sol supra medium caeli ad partem aquilonis cernitur, umbraeque versa vice contra meridiem videntur.

Waitz p. 49, l. 22 - p. 50, l. 17.

## GERVASE

metiuntur.

In Gallia Belgica xix et semis repertam legimus.

In Aegypto in Hierosolimis nullus est umbra.

In Arabia hoc ipso tempore sol supra medium caeli a parte aquilonis cernitur, umbrae versa vice contra meridiem videntur.

## 29

Triginta ferme a Sequanico litore Evodia insula milibus distat. In qua, sicut ab illius incolis adseveratur, vergentium in eandem Caribdin aquarum garrulitas auditur. Audiavi quendam nobilissimum...

Waitz 2 p. 51, ll. 8-10.

*De Caribdi et Voragine Maris Britannici*

Triginta ferme miliaribus a Sequanico litore proprie Burdegalum est Evodia Insula in qua vergentium est Caribdin aquarum garrulitas auditur. Est et consimilis absorbensque vorago in Adriatico mari Calabriam Siciliamque distinguens.

## 30

For item 30, Gervase returns to Justin's *Epitome*. It is a passage six hundred words long, entitled *De Statu Judeorum et Balsamo*, beginning: Quoniam circa Judeorum conversationem et vitam Joseph multa notabilia ex *Epitome* Justini super libros Pompei Trogi reperi, dignam duxi ipsam quoque annectere, and ending: facile tunc Romanis de alieno largientibus. It reproduces almost verbatim the account in Justin<sup>39</sup> of Antiochus' reconquest of the Jews, of the succession of Jewish kings from Damascus to Israhel, of Joseph, his skill in prophesy, of Moses, his expulsion from plague-ridden Egypt, his return to Damascus, of the prohibition against mingling "cum peregrinis" of the valley of Jericho

<sup>39</sup> See p. 246, l. 25 (Igitur Antiochus...)-249, l. 23 (... alieno largientibus.)



rich in balsam trees, and, although there is obvious textual corruption at the start, of the dead sea.

## JUSTIN

... ibi tepidi aeris <flatu> naturalis quaedam ac perpetua opacitas inest. In ea regione latus lacus est, que propter magnitudinem aquae et immobilitatem Mortuum Mare dicitur. Nam neque ventis movetur resistente turbinibus bitumine, quo aqua omnis stagnatur, neque navigationis patiens est, quoniam omnia vita carentia in profundum merguntur; nec materiam ullam sustinet, nisi quae alumine incrustatur.

See p. 249, ll. 9-16.

## GERVASE

... ibi tepidi aeris naturalis quaedam ac perpetua oppacitas inest. Que propter magnitudinem aque et immobilitatem Mortuum Mare dicitur. Nam neque movetur resistente turbinibus bitumine quo aqua omnis stagnatur, neque piscationes patiens est, quoniam omnia vita carentia in profundum merguntur, nec materiam aliquam sustinet nisi que alumine illustratur.

## 31

Item 31, entitled *De Parthis et Ortu Eorum*, is 578 words long. It begins: Parthi penes quos velut divisio orbis, and ends: reges suos Arsacis nomine nuncuparent. It derives from Justin's *Epitome*, as in Seel p. 276, l. 10 (Parthi, penes quos velut...) - 17 (... praeda victorum fuere.); l. 22 (A Romains quoque...) - p. 280, l. 1 (... ita virtutis expertae); l. 25 (sic Arsaces quaesito...) - p. 281, l. 2 (... suos Arsacis nomine nuncupent.) It follows the source closely in the main, although one brief and one substantial passage are omitted, and there is occasional rephrasing.

We have noted in passing much of the ample internal evidence that the addenda are in fact of Gervase's own authorship, or to speak more precisely, collection. The repeated occurrence of the first person: "annexui" (item 4), "diximus" (item 7), "annectamus" (item 26), "... multa notabilia ex *Epithomate* Justini super Libros Ponpei Trogi reperi, dignam duxi ipsam annectere" (item 30), and such connective references as, "Nunc ad cepta redeamus" (item 3), "Memine pridem me scripsisse signa que in morte Julii Cesaris apparuerunt, et que in morte Alexandri mater Olimpias per quietem vidit supra notavimus, signa mortis eius annectanda judicavi" (item 25), and of course the fact that items 9-16 appear as text in the autograph manuscript, are sufficient evidence that all thirty-one items as they appear in I were originally collected and composed by Gervase.

Indeed, they bear on the face of them, the marks of *collectanea*. They appear, with the exception of the integrated items, at the end of the book proper. Generally speaking, Gervase's focus of interest in, and intended use of the particular item that he is collecting is sufficiently

apparent. On the other hand, they differ from one another in the degree to which they have been readied for the text, and in the amount of what would appear to be unusable material which they carry from their several sources, ranging from such items as 1-4, deliberately selected and conjoined by the author for insertion at certain obviously appropriate points in the text, through cullings and paraphrases less compact and focussed, and of less certain destination (items 17-24), to pretty mechanical copyings of source-material, which would seem to require considerable rehandling before they could be fitted into the text of the *Otia*. For example, such titles as *De Calice*, *Aque et Arundinibus*, *De Ypotamis*, and *De Scorpionibus* indicate clearly the foci of Gervase's interest in these items, and suggest that the wonders they describe were intended to be added to the wonders of Book III. Yet, imbedded as they are in the narrative of Alexander's progress through India, they could hardly be intended for integration in their present form. We are observing, in short, a process of note taking, collection (evidently at the end of one or more manuscripts), and incorporation — the process, in short, of scholarship at all times and places.

For the incorporations of the addenda are also surely Gervase's. The items of the addenda which have been moved into the texts in MSS X and a, together with certain interpolations to be noticed presently, are pertinent and coherent expansions of those sections of the work where they have been inserted.<sup>40</sup> Item 1, for example, an account of the Hebrew names of the heavens, is inserted following the sentence: *hec pretereundum quod Judei septem < celos distinguunt, unicuique suum nomen contribuentes, et septem >*<sup>41</sup> *terras quas, ut aiunt, David fundamenta vocat, sacro septenario totum assignantes.* It follows logically and continues the matter in hand. Item 2 is likewise inserted appropriately in a description of India, though it changes focus as it proceeds with its account of Alexander's Indian exploits. Item 3, beginning as it does with the etymology of "Germania", fits nicely into II, 12 with connective references at both ends: *Porro a Danubio usque ad Alpes ex quibus oritur est Germania superior a germinando populos sic dicta. Hec versus occasum Reno, versus aquilonem Albio flumine terminatur. Qui et ipse de Alpibus oriens mare Ponticum ingreditur.* The item from

<sup>40</sup> To this general statement, one exception must be noted. In X the integration of item 7 has been badly bungled. The item is there broken into two parts, and the parts introduced at separate points in the text. The first part appears in sensible context in II, 27, but the second turns up in II, 29 in such fashion that a description of the walls of London suddenly becomes an account of the Gallic invasion of southern France. In MS a no such fracture of text and sense occurs.

<sup>41</sup> "celos... septem" in margin.

the addenda then proceeds: *Dicitur autem, ut prenotavi, Germania a germinando...* It concludes with the words: *nunc ad cepta redeamus.* Item 4 of the addenda expands (in X only) the account of the Gauls in II, 16 with material from Justin and begins with the acknowledgment in the first person of its source. Items 5 and 6 are integrated (in X only) with similarly relevant portions of the text.

Can we learn from these addenda anything more than we have hitherto of the relationship of  $\beta$ , and of these peculiar descendants of  $\beta$  to the autograph? Let us recall first that in MS I, while the addenda include twenty-three items not included in N, they include also seven items, namely 9-16, incorporated in the text proper of that manuscript, where they appear as III, 106 (part) and 127-132. It seems reasonable to conclude that versions, wherein items that appear as text proper in the autograph stand still among the addenda, are antecedent to the autograph itself. An original of I, then, seems in all likelihood to have been antecedent to and, in effect, a partial source of N.

It is probable, on the other hand, that versions wherein not only these items, but also other items of the addenda, have been incorporated in the text are subsequent to N. This latter situation obtains in versions a and X. Specifically, MS a not only integrates the items integrated in N, viz. 9-16, but two additional items (3 and 7) are in this version also moved into the text. MS X likewise, in addition to items 9-16, integrates seven other items (1-7).

In this light, MSS a and X take on decided importance; for if our reasoning hitherto is sound, we must recognize in these two manuscripts — exemplars, as we have seen, of manuscript group (II), distinctive in other respects from N and its lineal descendants — representatives of versions of the *Otia* which are not only composed by Gervase, but are subsequent to N, and evidence of his further work on the book.

These two manuscripts are, in fact, distinctive in numerous details; for in addition to the integration in them of addenda, they are characterized by other interpolations and by certain omissions. Moreover, they differ from one another. It is neither necessary nor practicable here to supply all details, but some notion of the chief traits distinguishing them from other manuscripts and from one another may be summarily indicated.

#### In *O.I.*

I, 3 MS a wants item 1  
I, 23

II, 1 omits a passage of approximately  
fifteen lines

MS X integrates item 1  
interpolates about five lines at the  
end of the chapter  
the same

|        |   |  |
|--------|---|--|
| II, 6  | wants items 2   | integrates item 2  |
| II, 12 | integrates item 3   | the same   |
| II, 13 | interpolates a brief passage  | interpolates the passage interpolated in a and two other brief passages  |
| II, 16 | wants item 4  |  |
| II, 26 | interpolates a passage of approximately ten lines   | integrates items 4   |
| II, 27 | wants items 5 and 6; integrates item 7  | integrates items 5, 6 and the first half of item 7. Interpolates a passage of approximately twenty-five lines, which include the phrase, "ut supra in titulo <i>De Europe</i> notavi." |
| II, 29 | interpolates a passage of three lines   | integrates the second half of item 7; the same interpolation; also another interpolation of approximately five lines   |
| II, 36 | concludes the chapter with a computation of the years from Adam ostensibly to 1217, although the actual figures do not support this date. | the same computations, in variant disregard of arithmetic, ostensibly to the year 1227   |
| III, 4 | interpolates a passage of ten lines, including the phrase, "a multis habemus expertum"  | the same   |
| III    | integrates items 9-16   | the same   |

The dating of the versions represented by a and X is obviously a matter of importance. If these versions are authentic and subsequent to that of the autograph, how late are they, and which is the later? How long did Gervase continue to revise and supplement his book? As regards the relative lateness of a and X, it is to be noted that a number of those items of the addenda which in X have been moved into the text are wanting in a, not only in the text but in the addenda as well. From this we may infer that as Gervase composed the X version, he usually discarded from the *collectanea* attached to the end of his basic manuscript ( $\beta$ ) those items which he integrated with the text. In its lack of these items a then would seem to represent a later though less complete derivative of  $\beta$  than X. But the problem of date is further complicated by the fact that in both X and a there appear arithmetically variant versions of a computation of the age of the world, presumably to the "present." I quote it here as it appears in a, citing X's variant readings in parenthesis:

Ex hinc ad picturam per occultatam (occultam) fidem nos transferamus. Subnectamus tamen quodam ab Ebreo scriptum ad computationem premis-

sam argumentum verissimum. Adam ergo vixit annis nongentis triginta (DCCCCXXX); etatis vero sue (suo) anno centesimo tricessimo genuit Seth; Seth anno etatis sue centesimo quinto genuit Enos, qui anno suo none-gessimo genuit Cainam, qui anno suo septuagessmo genuit Malalael, qui anno suo sexagessimo quinto (LXX) genuit Jarath, qui anno suo centesimo sexa-gessimo secundo genuit Enoch, qui anno suo sexagessimo quinto genuit Ma-tusalem, qui anno suo centesimo octuagessimo septimo genuit Lamech, qui anno suo centesimo octuagessimo secundo genuit Noah. Porro a Noe ad dilu-vium sunt anni sexcenti; a diluvio ad Abraham ducenti nonaginta duo; a quo ad Ysaac centum anni, a quo ad exitum Egipti quadringenti anni a quo usque ad primum templum quadringenti octogenta anni. Sane templum stetit quadrigentes decem annis; captivitas septuagenti. Secundum tem-plum stetit quadrigentis viginti et tunc a Tito est subversum. Et est summa tunc ab origine mundi tria milia octingenti trigenti octa (tria milia DCCCXX-VIII) anni Summa ergo totius usque ad anno Domini MCCXVII (MCC-XXVII) quatuor milia nongenti septuaginta septem anni.

These figures, it need hardly be said, are thoroughly confusing. The actual total of the time-spans as they are itemized in a is not the 3838 of a, but the 3828 of X. The figures of X, on the other hand, by the change of the date of Jareth's begetting of Malaleel from his sixty-fifth to his seventieth year, actually sum up to 3833. In attempting to fix the date at which these computations were entered, we of course subtract from the first total the date of the fall of Herod's temple (A. D. 70), add the date (d.), and arrive at the second total, 4977, thus:

$$\begin{array}{rcl} 3838 & & \\ \text{or} & & \\ 3828 & - 70 + d. = & 4977 \\ \text{or} & & \\ 3833 & & \end{array}$$

Now, according to a,

$$\begin{array}{rcl} d. = & 1217 & \\ \text{but} & & \\ 3838 & - 70 + 1217 = & 4985 \end{array}$$

According to X,

$$\begin{array}{rcl} d. = & 1227 & \\ \text{but} & & \\ 3828 & - 70 + 1227 = & 4985 \\ \text{or} & & \\ 3833 & - 70 + 1227 = & 4990 \end{array}$$

Our aim, in scrutinizing this puzzling arithmetic, is of course to fix, if possible, not one, merely, but three dates: 1) that of the original computation as it was inserted, presumably by Gervase, at a late stage in the evolution of  $\beta$ , 2) that of its copying in the version represented by X, and 3) that of its copying in the version represented by a. Let us

notice first that the infirmities and self-contradictions of  $\alpha$  and X suggest an infirmity at the correspondent point in their common source. It seems likely, in other words, that an original confusion of arithmetic in  $\beta$  lies behind the confusions of X and  $\alpha$ . Out of such a compounding of confusions it is perhaps unlikely that we shall extract any very firm fact. Let us nevertheless scan the figures a little more closely, in the hope of discovering at least the probabilities of the situation.

The figure 3828 seems a fair starting point. It is the correct total of  $\alpha$ 's sum, easily corruptible by a gratuitous "X," or a misreading of "viginti" as "triginti," and it is the figure entered (in defiance of arithmetic) as total in MS X. On the familiar principle that two things equal to one another are equal to the same thing, it seems reasonable to assume that 3828 stood as the first total in the common source. On the same principle, the total of all the years, 4977, may be presumed to be the original total of  $\beta$ , in which case the date of entering the computation in  $\beta$  would be fixed at MCCXIX :

$$3838 - 70 + d = 4977 \therefore d = 1219$$

There are, in fact, in the text of the *Otia*, a number of references to times, persons and events. There is in Book II a computation to the year 1211; there are references to William the Lion (ob. 1214) as "of blessed memory," to John "Lackland" (ob. 1216) as living, to Phillip Augustus, conqueror at Bouvines (27 July, 1214) as of precarious future, all of which proves (what the manuscript tradition confirms) that the work was composed over a period of years.

These bits of internal evidence are reviewed by M. Raoul Busquet in his "Gervais de Tilbury Inconnu."<sup>42</sup> Busquet opines that Gervase dedicated his book to the Emperor Otto at the end of 1213, concluding:

Après la dédicace et l'envoi de l'*Otium* à la fin de 1213 ou au commencement de 1214, Gervais de Tilbury devait vivre plus de sept ans. Il n'est pas surprenant qu'après avoir dirigé sur Cologne ce manuscrit offert à l'Empereur, il ait, au moins pendant quelque temps, augmenté de quelques additions l'exemplaire qu'il avait dû en conserver. Un seul de ces ajouts comporte une indication limitative de date: c'est le paragraphe, déjà signalé, relatif à l'épervier du roi d'Écosse Guillaume le Lion. Mais nous ne savons pas si d'autres passages ne sont pas également des additions postérieures à l'année 1213.

The foregoing tentative conclusions accord obviously with M. Busquet's, merely extending somewhat the period of "tinkering."

<sup>42</sup> *Rev. Hist.*, vol. 191 (1941) 7-8.

More significant perhaps is the fact that, according to our findings, MSS a and X probably represent respectively Gervase's latest version of the *Otia Imperialia*. The authority of N must in consequence be seen as somewhat less than asolute.

That it is, in the light of these apparently later versions, wholly overthrown, that MSS a and X should be now regarded basic texts for an edition of the work, is, however, a conclusion not warranted by the facts. "Latest copy" and "master copy" were, after all, not necessarily identical in the vocabulary of an author who apparently worked on two or more "original" copies simultaneously and continued to alter after "completion." X and a are representatives and late developments of the alternate version  $\beta$ , which, as we have noted, generates relatively few descendants. It was, if we regard integration of N's marginalia as measure of completeness, an incomplete version; for, as has been elsewhere shown, eleven of the marginal items wherewith Gervase supplemented the text of N never got into the text of  $\beta$ , and eight others were incomplete at the time of their integration. But whatever place  $\beta$  may have held in the author's mind and to whatever degree the author's final intention may be reflected in a and X, we have still the fact that it is MS N which dominates the textual tradition. Its marginalia have been incorporated in the great majority of copies. In it we have the tangible relics of the author, the ink of his pen.

Meanwhile, in the gathered addenda, some of it practically verbatim copy of the source, some of it excerpt and paraphrase, some of it author's afterthought; in the integration of selected items into successive versions of an author's original; in further interpolation, hastily revised two years later, we have some glimpses of how at least *this* mediaeval book took shape — or shapes.

*University of California*

# Chaucer's "Cursed Monk", Constantinus Africanus

MAURICE BASSAN

THAT "verray, parfit praktisour," the Doctour of Phisik, is well acquainted, Chaucer tells us in the General Prologue, with all the famous names (and, presumably, the works as well) of mediaeval medicine. The list is an impressive grouping of authorities both ancient and modern:

Wel knew he the olde Esculapius,  
And Deyscorides, and eek Rufus,  
Olde Ypocras, Haly, and Galyen,  
Serapion, Razis, and Avycen,  
Averrois, Damascien, and Constantyn,  
Bernard, and Gatesden, and Gilbertyn.<sup>1</sup> (I, 429-434)

One of these personages is also known to the Merchant. The monk Constantine is alluded to in his tale, in a usually neglected passage describing the benighted January's wedding festivities. The old knight is anxious to go to bed, but he has some serious drinking to get in first:

He drynketh ypocras, clarree, and vernage  
Of spices hoote, t'encreessen his corage;  
And many a letuarie hath he ful fyn,  
Swiche as the cursed monk, daun Constantyn,  
Hath written in his book *De Coitu*;  
To eten hem alle he nas no thyng eschu. (IV, 1807-1812)

Presumably his ambitious self-medication succeeds, if we are to judge by the coltishness, indeed, the depressing exhibition of vitality which succeeds the night's labors. But what of his lubricious mentor? One must be struck by the disparity in tone between the two passages cited thus far. In the first, Constantine partakes of the august company of Hippocrates, Galen, Rhazes, Avicenna, and Averroes; in the second, he has become a "cursed monk," who appears to have written a nasty book containing (in part, one gathers) information about aphrodisiacs. We

<sup>1</sup> The text is that of F. N. Robinson, ed., *The Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*, 2 vols. (Boston, 1957). A somewhat similar list, invoking the famous names of Hippocrates, Galen, Rhazes, Constantine, and Avicenna, appears in *Le Roman de la Rose*, lines 15959-15961; see the edition of Ernest Langlois, 5 vols. (Paris, 1914-1924), IV, p. 126.



turn for assistance to Professor Robinson's notes, but learn only that "Constantinus Afer (*Constantyn*), a monk of Carthage, brought Arabian learning to Salerno in the eleventh century."<sup>2</sup> For most readers of Chaucer, one ventures to suppose, that is the end of it, and Constantine remains obscure, mysterious, a bit ambiguous. The purpose of what follows is to point out in summary fashion the errors about Constantine lodged in traditional notes to the passages; to demonstrate, at some length, that Constantine is anything but an obscure monk — indeed, that he is an extremely important figure in the history of medicine; and finally, to suggest the contents and medical significance of the curious work alluded to by the Merchant. The aim throughout will be to understand Constantine's ambiguous position in Chaucer as eminent authority and "cursed monk."



The references to Constantine by writers on Chaucer are not reliable. There is not a shred of evidence that Constantine was a "monk of Carthage," as Robinson declares; and the editor's statement that the Monk "brought Arabian learning to Salerno" is doubtful, if not completely erroneous. Skeat, quoting Wright, correctly calls Constantine "a monk of Monte Cassino," but adds the extremely questionable remark that he was "one of the founders of the school of Salerno."<sup>3</sup> This last misconception is repeated by Lounsbury.<sup>4</sup> Tyrwhitt's comment that Constantine's works were printed at Basel in 1536 is only partly true, and misleading.<sup>5</sup> Curry recognizes the allusion to *De coitu*, and advises the "curious reader" to verify it by consulting Constantine's *Opera*: and then he proceeds to give the wrong page reference.<sup>6</sup> Indeed, the best commentator of all appears to be Thomas Warton; at least he is the most complete, for in his *Dissertations* he supplies some biographical information, and adds still useful discussions of the School of Salerno and the work of the translators at Monte Cassino. Even Warton, however, is unreliable. His Constantine was "born at Carthage" (a city which no longer existed in the eleventh century), and was "one of the Saracen physicians who... formed the Salernitan school" (that the monk

<sup>2</sup> Robinson, ed., *Works*, II, p. 662.

<sup>3</sup> Walter W. Skeat, ed., *The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*, 7 vols. (Oxford, 1894-1900), V, p. 41.

<sup>4</sup> Thomas R. Lounsbury, *Studies in Chaucer*, 3 vols. (New York, 1892), II, p. 394.

<sup>5</sup> Thomas Tyrwhitt, ed., *The Canterbury Tales of Chaucer*, 5 vols. (London, 1830), IV, p. 250. Cf. below, Note 13.

<sup>6</sup> Walter C. Curry, *Chaucer and the Mediaeval Sciences* (New York, 1926), p. 247.

was a Saracen, a physician, or a founder of the school are all doubtful suppositions).<sup>7</sup> Obviously, Chaucer's "cursed monk" merits closer, or at least more accurate, consideration.

The biography of Constantinus Afer, or Africanus, is a matter of considerable complexity. Two separate biographical accounts were written by a man generally called Peter the Deacon, the Librarian of the Benedictine monastery of Monte Cassino in the early twelfth century. The first of these is in the *Chronica monasterii Cassinensis*,<sup>8</sup> begun by Leo of Ostia and continued by Peter; the second is a work called *De viribus illustribus Cassinensibus*.<sup>9</sup> These accounts are substantially the same: both present a sketch of Constantine's life and a list of his works, and honor him as "a new and shining Hippocrates": Philosophicis studiis plenissime eruditus Orientis et Occidentis Magister, novusque effulgens Hippocrates. According to Peter, Constantine was born in 1015 in "Carthage" (a reference, undoubtedly, to Tunis), and studied among the Arabs, Persians, Chaldeans, Indians, Egyptians, and Ethiopians. His learning embraced grammar, dialectic, geometry, arithmetic, mathematics, astronomy, and medicine (*physica*); to this list in the *Chronicle* are added, in the *Lives*, the studies of music and necromancy. When Constantine returned to North Africa after nearly forty years of study, a plot was laid against his life. He fled across the Mediterranean to Salerno, and remained there in disguise until he was recognized by the brother of the Caliph who had entertained him in the East. Constantine was thus recommended to the service of Duke Robert Guiscard. When he left the Norman court it was to become a monk at Monte Cassino, where he remained until his death in 1087. This is the romantic story which was copied faithfully by Warton, and indeed by most historians of medicine up to our own time. In recent years, grave doubts have been cast upon the reliability of Peter the Deacon as a biographer and chronicler.<sup>10</sup> One of the best students of Constantine's life and

<sup>7</sup> Thomas Warton, *History of English Poetry*, 4 vols., ed. W. Carew Hazlitt (London, 1871), II, pp. 368-369.

<sup>8</sup> Lib. III, ch. 35. The most convenient source is Migne, PL 173, 767. See also L. A. Muratori, *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores*, IV, pp. 455-456.

<sup>9</sup> See Johann Fabricius, *Bibliotheca Graeca* (Hamburg, 1790), XIII, p. 123. Fabricius' *Bibliotheca Latina Mediae et Infimae Aetatis*, 3 vols. (Padua, 1754), I, p. 423 (a work cited by Tyrwhitt) was my starting point for all subsequent biographical investigation.

<sup>10</sup> According to Charles Singer, Peter's "main interest in writing is the exaltation of the monastery to which he was attached. Modern research has convicted him of the forgery of documents and the falsification of records": 'A Legend of Salerno,' *Johns Hopkins Hospital Bulletin* 28 (1917), p. 64. Substantiation of these charges may be found in Erich Caspar, *Petrus Diaconus und die Monte Cassineser Fälschungen* (Berlin, 1909), and in E. A. Loew, *The Beneventan Script* (Oxford, 1914).

influence concludes: «Disregarding the Deacon's tale and other stories, the bare and proven facts are very few... We have a group of twelve or fifteen medical books, both in old manuscripts and in print, which have been associated for 800 years with the name of Constantinus Africanus... The Constantinian books were first written not earlier than about 1070.”<sup>11</sup>

A speculative emendation of Peter's biography has been offered by Karl Sudhoff, who postulates that Constantine had come up from Sicily with the army of Robert Guiscard, to whom Salerno fell in 1077; in Sicily, he asserts, Constantine would have found all the Arabic books he needed for his purposes.<sup>12</sup> A later, and more clearly legendary account of the monk's life has been discovered by Charles Singer.<sup>13</sup> The relation of Constantine to the medical school which had begun to develop in the tenth century at Salerno<sup>14</sup> remains today a matter not only of conjecture, but of heated dispute. According to Lynn Thorndike, some scholars believe that Salerno's medical importance practically began with Constantine; “others have tried to maintain for Salernitan medicine a neo-Latin character quite distinct from Constantinus' introduction of Arabic influence.”<sup>15</sup> Leclerc argues that Constantine may have been drawn to Italy by the fame of the school, and adds (though not disparagingly): Il paraît même que la médecine arabe était déjà connu des médecins de Salerne.<sup>16</sup> The flourishing of the *Schola Salernitana* in the twelfth century, and the creation of a new medical literature, must be seen, then, as only possible functions of the inspiration received from the Constantinian translations of the eleventh century.<sup>17</sup>

<sup>11</sup> George W. Corner, *Anatomical Texts of the Earlier Middle Ages* (Washington, 1927), p. 12. Lucien Leclerc, in his *Histoire de la médecine arabe*, 2 vols. (New York, n.d.), I, pp. 539-540, tends to dismiss Peter's account as completely imaginative, and adds (p. 540): Jusqu'à présent nous avons fait de vaines recherches pour trouver une mention de Constantin chez les Arabes.

<sup>12</sup> *Kurzes Handbuch der Geschichte der Medizin* (Berlin, 1922), quoted in Corner, *op. cit.*, p. 13.

<sup>13</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 64-69.

<sup>14</sup> At the school, widely known as the “Civitas Hippocratica,” there were medical and surgical clinics, foundling hospitals, and men and women professors; see Sir William Osler, *The Evolution of Modern Medicine* (New Haven, 1921), p. 88; cf. p. 103.

<sup>15</sup> *A History of Magic and Experimental Science*, 7 vols. (New York, 1923-1934), I, p. 757. Thorndike's chapter on Constantine (I, pp. 742-759) is the best general treatment of the monk's works and his contributions to medicine, and I have relied heavily upon it.

<sup>16</sup> Leclerc, *op. cit.*, II, p. 356. Cf. Warton, *op. cit.*, I, p. 193.

<sup>17</sup> On this point also consult Henry E. Sigerist, *On the History of Medicine* (New York, 1960), p. 9, and Fielding H. Garrison, *An Introduction to the History of Medicine* (Philadelphia and London, 1922). The latter believes that Constantine's translations were “little noticed at Salerno” (p. 139), since his knowledge of Arabic culture would have alienated him from the sympathies of the Saracen-hating Salernitans.

Whatever Constantine's true history may have been, and whatever the facts, if any, of his relation to the Salernitan school, there is no doubt that he appeared at a propitious period for the revitalization of medicine in the West. The Greek medical tradition, with its sometimes conflicting doctrines, had exerted an extraordinary influence upon Arabian physicians and surgeons, many of whom had translated the works of Hippocrates, Galen, and others. This work of translation and assimilation flowered especially in the tenth and eleventh centuries, and it was to this glorious age of Arabian medicine that Constantine was, in some way or other, exposed. His books<sup>18</sup> are primarily translations of famous Arabic medical works, with, it is highly probable, emendations and additions of his own, just as his Arabic authorities had themselves both translated and modified their Greek authorities.<sup>19</sup> The most important of Constantine's translations into Latin include the *Aphorisms*, *Prognostics*, and *De Regimine Acutorum* of Hippocrates; the *Michrotechne* and *Megatechne*, with lesser Galenic and pseudo-Galenic works; Isaac the Jew's *Dietetics*, *Elements*, *Fevers*, and *Urines*; the *Viaticum* of Ibn al-Djazzar; and the *Pantegni*, a translation of the *Khitaab el Maleki* (Royal Art of Medicine) of Ali Ibn al-Abbas (Haly Abbas).<sup>20</sup>

Of the Latin works by Constantine on the complete list compiled in Steinschneider's monograph,<sup>21</sup> some, at least, appear to have been claimed by the monk as his original compositions.<sup>22</sup> Thus he has frequently been accused of duplicity and plagiarism. The preface to the longest of his translations and the one most frequently cited in the Middle Ages, the *Pantegni* of Haly Abbas, is introduced by Constantine's remark that he had composed *hoc nostrum opusculum* since he had failed to find the

<sup>18</sup> Establishing Constantine's texts is exceedingly complicated. Certain books are attributed to him by Peter, and some of these, plus others not so attributed, appear in Constantine's works first published in Basel in 1536 (sometimes called "Volume I") and 1539 ("Volume II"). In addition, eight of his translations appear in the *Opera Isaac* (Lyon, 1515), and there are separate editions, mostly sixteenth-century. The best discussions may be found in: George Sarton, *Introduction to the History of Science*, 3 vols. (Baltimore, 1927), I, p. 769; Moritz Steinschneider, 'Constantinus Africanus und seine arabischen Quellen,' *Virchow's Archiv für pathologische Anatomie und Physiologie* 37 (1866), pp. 351-410; and Steinschneider, *Die arabischen Übersetzungen aus dem griechischen* (Graz, 1960), p. 382.

<sup>19</sup> In dispute is the question of whether Constantine may have translated directly from Greek and Graeco-Roman works; the question would be resolved by an as yet unattempted close textual comparison of his total production to the ostensible sources.

<sup>20</sup> This summary is drawn from Corner, *op. cit.*, p. 13.

<sup>21</sup> 'Constantinus Africanus und seine arabischen Quellen,' pp. 353-354.

<sup>22</sup> No such "originality," it should be noted, is claimed for Constantine's works by Peter the Deacon: cf. Thorndike, *op. cit.*, I, p. 746.

materials for his treatise in the standard writers. In the twelfth century, Haly Abbas' next translator, Stephen of Pisa, attacked the "shrewd fraud" of Constantine. Thorndike concludes that Constantine did in fact not translate literally, but changed the order of materials, and omitted much information; this, he states, was done in accordance with standard Arabian practice.<sup>23</sup> Corner, on the contrary, finds his versions in general literal, comprehensible, and complete.<sup>24</sup> Another frequent criticism of Constantine is that his Latin style was barbarous; Corner urges, however, that a little mercy be shown "a scholar who was for practical ends putting an immense technical literature into a language unused by science for centuries past."<sup>25</sup>

These criticisms of Constantine aside, his importance as one of the first great communicators of ancient and modern learning to Western Europe cannot be discounted. He was, says Thorndike, "a much cited authority during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries in the works both of medicine and of natural science produced in Latin in western Europe, and his translations were cited under his own name rather than those of their original authors."<sup>26</sup> We know nothing of Constantine's actual practice of medicine, but it is clear how the confusion arose as to his being both a translator and a great doctor—even a "Salernitan physician"! Corner goes even further: "Constantine the African," he declares, "must be held among the founders of modern medicine and indeed of all modern biology. He gave the West... a great mass of important classical learning, in readable Latin, at a time when everything was ripe for growth. For a hundred years all western medical science grew out of these books, and when the thirteenth century brought new

<sup>23</sup> *Op. cit.*, I, pp. 746 ff.

<sup>24</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 16. The most satisfactory general review of Constantine's "plagiarism" is in Leclerc, *op. cit.*, II, pp. 358-365. While the accuracy of the monk's work is clearly questionable, the fact remains that he simply does not credit Haly Abbas, al-Djazzar, or any of the *Arabic* (as opposed to Greek) authorities. C. G. Cumston, in his *Introduction to the History of Medicine* (London, 1926), p. 220, declares that Constantine "took special pains to eliminate in his translations anything that might identify the original book. He eliminates all proper names which are too Oriental and substitutes his own..." Constantine's suppression of the names of his Arabic sources may stem, at least in part, from his recognition of the considerable feeling against the Arabs among his new countrymen.

<sup>25</sup> Corner, *op. cit.*, pp. 13-14. The view that the writer's Latin is really "excellent" is offered in Henry E. Sigerist, *The Great Doctors* (Garden City, 1958), p. 71. The entire discussion is probably founded on a misconception. According to Peter, Constantine's pupil, Atto, "copied into elegant Latin style the works which the said Constantine had translated."

<sup>26</sup> Thorndike, *op. cit.*, I, p. 743.

translators who were able to comprehend and to translate Aristotle and Avicenna, their seed fell upon ground plowed by Constantine.”<sup>27</sup> This view is supported by Donald Campbell, who, while chastising Constantine for failure to quote his sources and for writing “defective” Latin, admits that his work “revived the study of Hippocrates and Galen in Europe. Even after the two Gerards in Toledo had produced their more accurate translations, his versions continued to be read as authoritative and standard works.”<sup>28</sup> And George Sarton adds, somewhat wryly: “Thanks to the intellectual apathy of most physicians and the inertia of the early printers, thousands of people continued to read Arabic medicine in its Constantinian garb until the end of the sixteenth century.”<sup>29</sup>

This direct influence of Constantine upon the succeeding centuries may be traced, for our purposes, right up to the time of Chaucer. The monk's influence may be detected in various works of the Salernitan school, such as the antidotary of Nicholas of Salerno, the surgical treatises by Roger of Salerno, and the anatomical works of Maurus.<sup>30</sup> In the thirteenth century, the medical systems of Albert the Great and Bartholomew the Englishman, and the surgical treatises of Bruno da Longoburgo and Lanfranc of Milan were written under Constantinian influence.<sup>31</sup> In 1309, Pope Clement V included the works of Constantine among those required for the license from the University of Montpellier, the main center of medical teaching in France.<sup>32</sup> To Constantine was credited one of the most popular scientific works of the Middle Ages, a translation of the *materia medica* of Dioscorides.<sup>33</sup> In the fourteenth century, such eminent Englishmen as John of Gaddesden and John of Mirfeld, not to mention others, drew upon the rich reservoirs of knowledge made viable to the West by the monk of Monte Cassino.<sup>34</sup> It is little wonder, then, that Roger Bacon, about the year 1268, groups as medical authorities the names of Hippocrates, Galen, Constantine, Rhazes, Haly Abbas, and Isaac,<sup>35</sup> or that we find similar conjunctions,

<sup>27</sup> Corner, *op. cit.*, p. 14.

<sup>28</sup> *Arabian Medicine and the Middle Ages*, 2 vols. (London, 1926), I, pp. 122-124.

<sup>29</sup> Sarton, *op. cit.*, II, 1, p. 67.

<sup>30</sup> Sarton, *op. cit.*, II, 1, pp. 239-240; 435; 436. Also see the standard edition of Salernitan writings: Salvatore De Renzi, *Collectio Salernitana*, 5 vols. (Naples, 1852-1859).

<sup>31</sup> Sarton, *op. cit.*, II, 2, pp. 586; 939; 1079.

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*, III, 1, p. 247.

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*, III, 1, p. 442.

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.*, III, 1, pp. 870; 877; 881; 884; 1705; 1707.

<sup>35</sup> *De erroribus medicorum*, ed. A. G. Little and E. Withington, British Society of Franciscan Studies, vol. XIV (Oxford, 1927), p. 154: Hoc docent auctores medicine, scilicet Ypocrates, Galienus, Constantinus, Rasy, Haly, Ysaac.

always including Constantine, in the *Romance of the Rose*, and in the Prologue to the *Canterbury Tales*.

\* \* \*

Having raised many, and perhaps settled a few, questions of Constantinian biography and influence, we may turn rapidly to the main problem at hand, the work *De coitu* as the probable basis for the Merchant's denomination of Constantine as the "cursed monk."<sup>36</sup> The existence of a learned treatise on the subject is scarcely surprising in the light of traditional medical theory up until around 1500. Comments on coitus may be found in Hippocrates and Galen, Rufus of Ephesus (2nd Cent.), Aretaeus of Cappadocia (2nd-3rd Cent.), Paul of Aegina (625-690), Albucasis (936-1013), Costa Ben Luca (10th Cent.), Haly Abbas (d. 994), Rhazes (860-932), Isaac (d. 932 or 941), and Avicenna (980-1037); and this is only a partial list.<sup>37</sup> The remarks of these writers are sometimes incidental, sometimes, as in the case of Avicenna and Rhazes, sufficient to occupy an entire book.<sup>38</sup> While it is not my intention to trace the subject from Hippocrates to Constantine and beyond, it is important here to note two distinct purposes served by these discussions.

The first was the establishment of coitus as a valuable remedy for various afflictions. In post-Hippocratic theory, which is as much as to say in the humoral theory of disease, continence was regarded as damaging to the body. In the words of an historian of medicine :

If the semen remained too long in its receptacles it not only became altered and gave rise to gonorrhea, but sent off acrid vapors which ... caused epilepsy mania, melancholy, and led to sexual irregularities. This conception of the origin of epilepsy induced some physicians to prescribe coitus for the disease.<sup>39</sup>

Although these ideas were deprecated as early as the second century, they survived, to be restated not only by Paul of Aegina (who recom-

<sup>36</sup> A microfilm of the entire *Opera* of 1536 was kindly placed at my disposal by Mr. Thomas Herndon, to whose profound knowledge of mediaeval medical history I may here pay debt. In this place let me also acknowledge the careful criticism of my manuscript by Professors Norman E. Eliason and Robert J. Getty, and Mr. Francis M. Nichols.

<sup>37</sup> Cf. Leclerc, *op. cit.*, I, pp. 478, 529; II, p. 62.

<sup>38</sup> Cf. the treatments in Avicenna's *Canon* (Venice, 1564), Book III, pp. 886ff, and in Rhazes' *Continens* (Venice, 1529), Vol. XI, pp. 222ff.

<sup>39</sup> Cecilia C. Mettler, *History of Medicine*, ed. Fred A. Mettler (Philadelphia and Toronto, 1947), p. 608.

mended coitus as a remedy for mania and melancholy), but by other learned Christians and Moslems up to 1500. According to Professor Lowes's brilliant article written almost half a century ago, the malady of *amor hereos*, the madness caused by love, is almost always associated with melancholy in the works of mediaeval medical writers, and there is a standard remedy, one which, along with the use of wine, "is perhaps most uniform in its occurrence in the various discussions: 'Coitus igitur, quia laetificat et calefacit, et bonam digestionem inducit, ideo bene competit quibus est permissum, dum tamen fiat secundum temperamentum'." <sup>40</sup>

The second purpose served by scholarly discussions of coitus was the introduction of varying amounts of erotic lore, an end not, perhaps, properly fused with the first discussed. Some of this lore appeared in works properly concerned with obstetrics and gynecology, such as the famous *De passionibus mulierum* by the probably apocryphal Salernitan midwife "Trotula." <sup>41</sup> Other books were distinctly Ovidian in character. Still others were works half-medical, half-erotic, almost exclusively represented by Arabic or Persian publications. According to Sarton, these contain "in various proportions advice on sexual intercourse, gynecological prescriptions, proverbs on men and women in love, recipes for all kinds of aphrodisiac or anaphrodisiac foods and drugs, smutty anecdotes, etc." <sup>42</sup> This erotic tradition probably precedes the thirteenth century; after that time, "the congress of the sexes was magnified into a distinct science, known as the 'Ilm-ul-Bâh,' and was looked upon as a branch of medicine just like anatomy." <sup>43</sup> Numerous monographs which we would call purely pornographic were produced by such diverse figures as Samû'l bin Yahyâ, Ibn Nasr, al-Suyuti, and even Moses Maimonides, whose treatise *Maqala fi'l jima* includes a learned discussion of the utility and harmfulness of intercourse as well as various remedies and prescriptions. <sup>44</sup> An ancillary aspect of Moslem eroticism is revealed in treatises on materia medica, which always contain a rich assortment of aphrodisiacs and anaphrodisiacs. <sup>45</sup>

<sup>40</sup> John Livingston Lowes, 'The Lover's Malady of Hereos,' *Modern Philology* 11 (April, 1914), p. 502, n. 1. Lowes is quoting Bernardus Gordonius.

<sup>41</sup> Sarton, *op. cit.*, II, 1, p. 242.

<sup>42</sup> Sarton, *op. cit.*, II, 1, p. 80.

<sup>43</sup> Cyril Elgood, *A Medical History of Persia and the Eastern Caliphate* (Cambridge, 1951), p. 294.

<sup>44</sup> Cf. Arturo Castiglione, *A History of Medicine* (New York, 1941), p. 277.

<sup>45</sup> Sarton, *op. cit.*, II, 1, p. 80, perhaps ironically ascribes these interests to the institution of polygamy. In I, pp. 573-574, Sarton cites the contrasting views of Salmawaih Ibn Bunan



The *De coitu* of Constantinus Africanus,<sup>46</sup> which acknowledges a measure of indebtedness to five authorities — Hippocrates, Galen, Rufus, Isaac, and Dioscorides — serves both ends just described. The book begins with a serious appraisal of biological necessity:

Creator volens animalium genus firmiter ac stabiliter permanere per coitum illud ac per generationem disposuit renovari, ut renovatum ex toto interitum haberet. Ideoque complevit animalibus naturalia membra quae huic operi apta forent, & propria, eisque tam admirabilem virtutem, & amabilem delectationem inservit, ut nullum sit animalium, quod non vehementur delectetur per coitum. Nam si animalia abhorrerent animalium genus pro certo perirent. In tantum enim naturaliter coitus inest animalibus, ut per multa tempore impeditus cum explendi possibilitas affuerit, pene omni ratione postposita fiat.<sup>47</sup>

Constantine proceeds to discuss the uses of the members of generation, the humoral basis of the production of the seminal fluid, the theories of the origin of the sexes, and the advantages and disadvantages of intercourse. His use of authority in the latter discussion is typical:

Et quod Galen dixit in libro in commentariis in libros Hippocratis vulgarium morborum: Unicuique cui superabundat phlegma viscosum, fueritque ei robur virium, & illi qui abundat fumus acutus, exhalans, qui sua natura infestat temperantiam corporis, his quidem prodest. Prodest autem illi cui superabundat phlegma non viscosum, si fuerit robustus, quia evacuatur humor per coitum: & raro fiat, quia calor, qui fit ex frequenti motu coitus, condensat & desiccatur.<sup>48</sup> ... Rufus vero ait: Quod coitus soluit malum habitum corporis, & furorem mitigat. Prodest melancholicis, & amentes revocat ad noticiam, & soluit amorem concupiscentis, licet concumbat cum alia quam concupiuit ... Dicit vero Hippocrates: Habenti aegritudinem in augmento, coitus valde nocet.<sup>49</sup>

The last third of the work turns directly to both general and specific remedies for the symptoms of sexual disorders:

Revertemur ad ea quae coitum provocant. Sed quia diximus quia sune quidam qui non possint coire, appetunt autem, & exposuimus causam quart

(d. 839), a Christian physician and translator who "realized the perniciousness of aphrodisiacs."

<sup>46</sup> The treatise occupies pages 299 through 307 of the *Opera* of 1536, whose title-page begins: *CONSTANTINI/AFRICANI POST HIPPOCRATEM ET GALENUM, QUO-rum Graecae linguae doctus, sedulus fuit lector, medicorum nulli prorsus, mul/tis doctissimis testibus, posthabendi opera, conquisita undique magno studio, iam primum typis evulgata,...* (Basileae, apud Henricum Petrum, 1536).

<sup>47</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 299.

<sup>48</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 302-303.

<sup>49</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 303.

ab appetitu ipsorum seperentur, de cibis generantibus semen, & extinguentibus, oportet nos scire, quae sunt nutrimenta quae generant semen, & quae extinguunt, & quae stimulant appetitum, & quae prohibent,... & iterum quae sunt illa quae desiccant, & diminuunt semen ...<sup>50</sup>

Specific foods are then proposed as valuable for the production and drawing out of semen,

sicut sunt nutrimenta, quae diximus, piper, polipi, pineae, ficus, recentes carnes, cerebella, & vitella ovorum. Sunt etiam in his, testiculi vulpis, id est, satyrion, quia accendit libidinem [...] Dicit etiam Dioscor. quia haec radix dum manu tenetur, venerem stimulat, & si cum vino bibita fuerit, amplius accendit. Similiter zingiber venerem commovet, & accendit, & been rubeum & album, & costum dulce, & crocus orientalis, & lini semen cum melle coctum, addito pipere abundanter comestum ... Quia contraria contrariis curantur. Haec vero sunt quae non generant semen, sed desiccant, & dissoluunt ventositatem, scilicet quicquid est calidum & siccum, sicut anethum, ruta, & his similia ... Sed utilis est quia excitat appetitum stomachi, & urinam movet. Haec vero quae impediunt, & prohibent semen, & densant, & extinguunt libidinem sunt nutrimenta frigida, sicut sunt lactucae, portulacae, & cucurbitae, betae, morae celsi, citroli, cucumeres, melones,... Quicquid vero est frigidum & siccum, comprimit venerem, ut sumac, acetum, uvae amarae ...<sup>51</sup>

After stating these general suggestions, the author devotes his final pages to a listing of (possibly) laboratory-tested aphrodisiacs and an-aphrodisiacs; and he includes himself as a reputable authority:

Nunc vero dicendum de medicamentis quae prosunt non valentibus coire, & quia compositae potiones inveniuntur proficientes ad coitum, & inveniuntur apud divites & pauperes ... Istae praetermittimus, quia in manibus multorum inveniuntur, & dicimus quae experti sumus, & quibus usi sunt auctores nostri, quae cito operantur, & leniter perficiunt effectum.<sup>52</sup>

Of the "many a letuarie" offered the reader, several typical examples may be cited here:

Electuarium probatum quod auget libidinem: Rec. seminis asparagi, satyrionis, drach. 5. buzarangae, rubei & albi, been albi, zingiberis, drach. 3. seminis rapae, seminis erucae, seminis radices, dauci, urticae seminis, ceparum seminis, drach. 2. scyllae assae, umbilici, drach. 3. cardamomi, drach. 7. linguae avis, drach. 1. sacchari drach. 20. tere & dabis drach. 4. cum elixatura siliginis, aut lacte, aut mulsa.<sup>53</sup> ... Elect. quod composuit Isaac ad augmen-

<sup>50</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 304. Constantine also emphasizes the general importance of good nutrition. According to the humoral theory of Avicenna, for example, the sperm is generated from the humors conveyed to the testicles by the veins; these humors are the overflow of the food in the body in its fourth stage of digestion: cf. Alan H. Walton, *Aphrodisiacs: From Legend to Prescription* (Westport, Conn., 1958), p. 61.

<sup>51</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 305-306.

<sup>52</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 306.

tum coitus optimum: Rec. platocimini, erucae, drach. 10. zingiberis, 15. satyrionis, drach. 10. pineae mundatae, drach. 20. anisi, drach. 7. tere & frica diutissime, cum butyro, & tempera cum melle ...<sup>54</sup>

Complicated instructions are superadded for the concoction of pills, and for the preparation of those things which "extrinsecus apponenda sunt." With these useful hints, the *De coitu* closes.<sup>55</sup>

\* \* \*

This work of Constantine is only rarely alluded to after the eleventh century, but it was almost certainly widely known, especially since it contained valuable information perfectly in accord with standard medical precepts. Whether it gained some notoriety as well as repute would be more difficult to ascertain. The existence of the book itself certainly did not weigh against Constantine's immense general reputation; and as late as the fifteenth century the book is cited as part of the traditional discussion of gender, disease, and the "secrets of women."<sup>56</sup> Although, then, it is doubtful whether his reputation suffered because of this particular book, one must recall the more general criticisms of Constantine as writer and as translator discussed earlier in this paper. He was to be frequently criticized, from the twelfth century to our own, for "plagiarism," for writing bad Latin, for downright bad translating. This last point may profitably be explored a bit further here. I have noted Stephen of Pisa's criticism of Constantine's translation of the *Pantegni*. Another critic of Constantine's translations was Moses Ibn Tibbon (fl. 1240-83),<sup>57</sup> and still another was the very influential Italian

<sup>53</sup> *Loc. cit.*

<sup>54</sup> *Loc. cit.* The provenance of many of the ingredients of Constantine's electuaries is Eastern: cf. *The Herbal of Rufinus*, ed. Lynn Thorndike (Chicago, 1946). Sources may also be traced in Robert T. Gunther, *The Greek Herbal of Dioscorides* (Oxford, 1934), and in Walton, *op. cit.*

<sup>55</sup> Constantine also deals with problems of sexual activity in Book V of his *Pantegni*, in a section called "De His Qui Coire Non Possunt": this work has been published and discussed by Gerda Hoffmann, 'Beiträge zur Lehre von der durch Zauber verursachten Krankheit und ihrer Behandlung in der Medizin des Mittelalters,' *Janus* 37 (1933), pp. 129-144, 179-192, 211-217. A version of this work, which deals largely with the impotence caused by witchcraft, is translated in Sigerist's *History*, pp. 147-150.

<sup>56</sup> In his *Storia Della Medicina*, 3 vols. (Livorno, 1855), II, p. 344, Francesco Puccinotti, as part of an attempt to establish the authenticity of the *De coitu* as a text by Constantine, declares that "Questo libro trovasi più volte citato come proprio di Constantino da Giovanni de Retham Alemanno, scrittore del secolo XV di varii trattati." Thus Giovanni links "l'autorità di Constantino insieme con quella d'Aristotele: secundum Constantinum et Aristotelem, nel problema sulla genesi de'sessi diversi."

<sup>57</sup> Sarton, *op. cit.*, II, 2, p. 849.

physician of the thirteenth century, Taddeo Alderotti (c. 1223-1303), one of the founders of the medical school of Bologna. Alderotti "realized the necessity of direct translations of the medical classics from Greek into Latin and encouraged their preparation."<sup>58</sup> In the light of Alderotti's considerable importance and influence, his remarks on the monk of Monte Cassino have peculiar significance. In his commentary on Hippocrates' *Aphorisms*, he declares slashingly at the outset:

Translationem Constantini persequar, non quia melior, sed quia communior ; nam ipsa pessima est et defectiva et superflua ; nam *ille insanus monachus* [Italics mine] in tr. nsferendo peccavit quantitate et qualitate.<sup>59</sup>

Alderotti's epithet *insanus* is curious, to say the least, when we remember Constantine's eminence. If there was a tradition as to Constantine's "insanity," it survives only in this passage. But if we are not to take the word literally, it may mean simply foolish; or outrageous; or infuriating; or, very likely, *untrustworthy*. Thus we may state a *possible* sequence of events thus: Alderotti's contemptuous criticism of Constantine, based upon the monk's barbaric translations, was perpetuated through such pupils as Henry de Mondeville, and became part of the conventional fourteenth century view of Constantine among learned men, a view, it must be added, which could be held along with the belief that Constantine was one of the great "physicians" of the mediaeval tradition. Thus Chaucer could both cite Constantine among the great medical authorities, and cause him to be labeled, in a different context, a "cursed monk."

These are difficult matters to adjudge, since we must make the best of casual references. My feeling is that the double vision of Constantine I have just elucidated is somewhat shaky in its premises and inferences; more important, it fails to take into sufficient account the *context* of the allusion in the *Merchant's Tale*. I incline rather to the view that the book *De coitu* had achieved something of a *sub rosa* reputation by Chaucer's time, and that indeed the preachment of aphrodisiacs as part of the standard *materia medica* was felt to be a pernicious adaptation of Arabic lore. The epithet "cursed" I thus take to be applicable not to the monk as translator, but only to the Constantine who wrote *De coitu*, and made his wicked prescriptions available for such old dotards as January. A double vision of some sort must remain as the central feature of an interpretation.

<sup>58</sup> *Ibid.*, II, 2, p. 1086.

<sup>59</sup> This statement is quoted in Lowes, *op. cit.*, p. 513, n. 4. Lowes notes the parallel to Chaucer's epithet, but does not discuss the matter further.

It remains only to be noted that Chaucer may very well have known the work at first hand. In addition to its possibly wide circulation in manuscript among men of the medical profession, it may be found among the late fourteenth century acquisitions of Merton College. In 1372 there appeared at Merton, from the library of William Durand Aristotle's *De animalibus*, which included a now lost *Liber de coitu*, probably the one by Constantinus Africanus.<sup>60</sup> Later on, Merton College acquired, as a present from Thomas Duncan, fellow of Merton and physician to the Earl of March, a medical volume containing eighteen assorted items including Constantine's provocative treatise.<sup>61</sup>

*University of North Carolina*

<sup>60</sup> F. M. Powicke, *The Mediaeval Books of Merton College* (Oxford, 1931), p. 159. As I have implied earlier, the popularity of this subject may now unalterably confuse the problem of manuscripts. Thus this book may possibly be any one of the volumes on the subject by the Arabians (Rhazes, Avicenna, Haly Abbas) in Latin translation; it may be that of Arnald of Villanova; or it may be that of "Alexander." This last figure is the author of a *De coitu* listed in the Bodleian collection (*Summary Catalogue of Western Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library* [Oxford, 1937], Vol. II, Part II, Item 3541, p. 675), a Latin MS of the thirteenth century which begins differently from Constantine's treatise. This Alexander may be Alexander of Aphrodisias, an Aristotelian commentator of the 3rd Century (cf. Sarton, *op. cit.*, I, pp. 318-319), or possibly the sixth century Byzantine physician Alexander of Tralles (cf. Sarton, *op. cit.*, I, p. 453). On this vexed question, also see Steinschneider, 'Constantinus Africanus...', p. 404, and *The Herbal of Rufinus*, p. xxx.

<sup>61</sup> Powicke, *op. cit.*, pp. 198-199.

In addition to the books and articles cited in the notes, the following sources will be found useful in an appraisal of Constantinus Africanus: Brockelmann, Carl, *Geschichte der arabischen Litteratur*, 2 vols. and supplements (Leiden, 1943); Browne, Edward G., *Arabian Medicine* (Cambridge, 1921), p. 68; Choulant, Ludwig, *Handbuch der Bücherkunde für die ältere Medizin* (Leipzig, 1841), pp. 253-256; Daremberg, Charles V., *Notices et extraits des Manuscrits Médicaux* (1853), pp. 63-100; *Encyclopedia Britannica*, 1959, II, 97; Geyl, A., 'Zwei lateinische Handschriften...', *Janus* 14 (1909), pp. 161-166; Giacosa, Piero, *Magistri Salernitani* (Torino, 1901), pp. 299-300; Gruner, C. G., *De variolis et morbillis fragmenta medicorum Arabistarum* (Jena, 1790); Hartmann, Friedrich, *Die Literatur von Fruh- und Hochsalerno* (1919), pp. 9-14; MacKinney, Loren C., *Early Mediaeval Medicine* (Baltimore, 1937), p. 211; Meyer, E. H. F., *Geschichte der Botanik* (1856), III, pp. 471-484; Mosolf, Adolf, *Zeithilfliche Randbemerkungen zu einem Viaticus-Text* (Diss., Leipzig, 1924); *Isis* 7, p. 536; Nord, Karl, *Zahnheilkundliches aus den Schriften Konstantins von Afrika* (Diss., Leipzig, 1922); Osler, Sir William, ed., *Bibliotheca Osleriana* (Oxford, 1929), Items 3891 and 7626; Rolleston, J. D., 'Chaucer and Mediaeval Medicine,' *Comptes Rendus du IX<sup>e</sup> Congrès International d'Histoire de la Médecine* (Bucharest, 1932), pp. 646-658; Singer, Charles and Dorothy W., 'The School of Salerno,' *History* n.s. 10 (1925), pp. 242-246; *Idem*, 'The Origin of the Medical School of Salerno,' in *Essays on the History of Medicine* (Zurich, 1923); Steinschneider, Moritz, *Die hebraeischen Übersetzungen des Mittelalters und die Juden als Dolmetscher* (Graz, 1956), pp. 656, 789-790, 1052; Sudhoff, Karl, "Die medizinischen Schriften...", *Archiv für Geschichte der Medizin* 9 (1915-16), pp. 348-356; *Idem*, 'Konstantin der Afrikaner und die Medizinschule von Salerno,' *Archiv für Geschichte der Medizin* 23 (1930), pp. 293-298.

# The "Castle of Perseverance": Redactions, Place, and Date

JACOB BENNETT

THE position of the *Castle of Perseverance* in the history of early English drama is a key one. Not only is it the oldest complete morality play extant in the language, it is also esthetically the most perfect. Yet, in spite of the significance of the play, scholarship has not succeeded in clarifying the important questions of place and date.<sup>1</sup> Inability to answer these questions has been largely due to failure to recognize that a still more basic problem has always existed: the play as it has come down to us in the extant copy<sup>2</sup> is not the original *Castle of Perseverance* but rather a version containing two major redactions, each composed at a different time by a different writer.

The presence of redactions, although naturally complicating any historical study of the play, does not make the problem of place and date insoluble. The alterations within the work are clearly enough defined to permit them to be separated from the original portion of the play and from each other. It then becomes possible by means of close philological analysis to place and date with a high degree of accuracy not only the original part of the play but each of the redactions as well. Furthermore, careful study of the structure of the extant version throws light on the development of the *Castle of Perseverance* from its original form, through the redactions, to the version which is known today; and, by implication, this same study reveals much about the general evolution of the morality play as a dramatic form in England.

The first redaction consists of the entire vexillator passage, the first twelve stanzas of the play (ll. 1-156).<sup>3</sup> The second consists of the latter

<sup>1</sup> See especially *The Macro Plays*, ed. F. J. Furnivall and Alfred W. Pollard (London, EETS, E.S., XCI), p. xxiv and pp. xxxiii-xlii; and Walter K. Smart, 'The *Castle of Perseverance*: Place, Date and a Source,' *The Manly Anniversary Studies* (Chicago, 1923), pp. 42-49.

<sup>2</sup> The *Castle of Perseverance* is one of three morality plays in one binding known collectively as the Macro Moralities, the other two being *Mankind* and *Wisdom*, the latter also known as *Mind, Will and Understanding*. The Macro Moralities are in the possession of the Folger Shakespeare Library.

<sup>3</sup> All analyses and transcriptions in this study have been made from photographs of the original Macro manuscript. Throughout this article the same stanza and line numbering will be used as in Furnivall and Pollard's EETS edition of *The Macro Plays*.



stanzas are questionable because of grammatical and syntactical weaknesses.

The fact that the original poet uses a comparatively large number of 9-line stanzas is significant in that the vexillator passage contains none and the Daughters of God passage only one; but more significant is the original poet's use of the shorter form for dramatic effect. Appropriately enough, he uses the shorter stanza for the most part in passages of the drama where the action is speeded up at some point of suspense or climax, as, for example, in argumentative dialogue (st. 31-38), and in passages depicting physical struggle, such as battle scenes and beatings (st. 193-196, 208-211, 153, 157, 165, 173-182). On the other hand, in the Daughters of God episode, which is almost entirely argumentative, the 9-line stanza is used only once (270), and here the subject matter is merely a prolongation of that of the preceding stanza, spoken by the same actor.

A much more conclusive test than stanza form for separating the three parts of the play is meter. The original poet seems to have been an extremely conscientious metrist, and perhaps a major criticism of his art from a modern point of view is that the extreme metrical regularity of his lines creates considerable monotony. The lines of both redactions are noteworthy, on the other hand, for their metrical irregularity, an irregularity, moreover, in which the redactions differ from each other.

In 172 of his 13-line stanzas the original poet uses the scheme ababab<sup>4</sup>c<sup>3</sup>ddd<sup>4</sup>c<sup>3</sup>, and the number of accents in the line is always rigidly adhered to according to pattern. Of the 2,236 lines in the 172 stanzas, only one line is doubtful, st. 198, 1.2, *azeyns pis castel I vowe*, which appears to have only three accents. In the remaining 13-line stanzas the first 8 lines all have 4 accents, and the conclusions, although containing some variations from each other, manifest the same regularity of meter.

This metrical regularity is not characteristic of the redactions, and many of their lines are difficult to scan because of the indefinite rhythm and also because of grammatical and syntactical crudities. In general, the lines in the vexillator redaction are longer than the corresponding stanza lines of the original.<sup>4</sup> The first three stanzas of this redaction, for example, follow these patterns: a<sup>6</sup>b<sup>5</sup>a<sup>4</sup>b<sup>4</sup>a<sup>5</sup>b<sup>5</sup>a<sup>5</sup>-b<sup>5</sup>c<sup>1</sup>d<sup>3</sup>d<sup>3</sup>d<sup>3</sup>c<sup>3</sup>; a<sup>4</sup>b<sup>5</sup>a<sup>5</sup>b<sup>4</sup>a<sup>5</sup>b<sup>4</sup>a<sup>4</sup>b<sup>4</sup>c<sup>1</sup>d<sup>5</sup>d<sup>5</sup>d<sup>5</sup>c<sup>5</sup>; a<sup>5</sup>b<sup>4</sup>a<sup>5</sup>b<sup>4</sup>a<sup>4</sup>b<sup>4</sup>a<sup>4</sup>b<sup>4</sup>c<sup>1</sup>d<sup>4</sup>d<sup>5</sup>d<sup>5</sup>c<sup>5</sup>.<sup>5</sup> Of the

<sup>4</sup> See the pages of the EETS edition.

<sup>5</sup> The difficulty in scansion has been mentioned. There could be some disagreement concerning the number of accents in some of the stanzas of both redactions.



36 13-line stanzas in the Daughters of God redaction, only 7 compare in completeness of metrical regularity with the same stanza form in the original (st. 275, 287, 288, 289, 290, 292, 295). Some of the lines in this latter redaction tend to be of greater length than the lines of the original, but unlike the situation in the vexillator passage, where the lines are consistently longer, some of the lines in the Daughters of God episode are shorter than those of the original portion of the play. Short lines (less than 4 accents) are found, for example, in the expositions of stanzas 286, 296, 297, 298, 299, 300, 301, 304, 312.

Another test for separating the three parts of the play is alliteration, and examination shows that the redactions differ from each other and also from the original portion both in the quantity and in the quality of the alliteration used. The original poet was as painstaking in finding the letter as he was in attaining metrical regularity. Alliterative lines are found in every one of his stanzas, and his alliteration has about it an ease and fluency which unquestionably set it apart from the alliteration of the redactions. The alliteration in the vexillator redaction is forced and prosaic, and the Daughters of God redaction contains comparatively little. Of the 37 13-line stanzas in the latter episode, 8 contain no alliteration whatsoever, and 16 contain only one or two alliterative phrases, many of which could be the result of coincidence rather than of any conscious effort on the part of the writer. A few stanzas of this redaction, however, do contain a number of alliterative lines, such as st. 313 and 288, which have 8 and 6 alliterative lines respectively. Some of these more heavily alliterating lines, as will be pointed out later, were possibly taken, at least in part, from an original ending of the play.

In the matter of grammar and syntax also, the original poet is more refined than either of the redactors. His sentences are all clear and concise, and errors of a grammatical nature are difficult to find, whereas most of the stanzas of both redactions are characterized by awkwardness of expression and grammatical confusion. And as for poetical style, there can be little doubt that the original poet is more gifted than either of the later writers. No lines of either redaction, for example, can compare in effectiveness of figurative language, controlled diction, smoothness, and appropriateness to speaker, with the following lines of Garcio written by the older poet :

þe werld bad me þis gold a-reste,  
holt & hallys & castell clere;  
þe werldys joye & hys jentyl jeste  
Is now þyne, now myn, boþe fere & nere;  
go hens, for þis is myne.

(ll. 2957-61)

As a final criterion for separating the redactions from the original part of the play, we must consider the matter of dramatic effectiveness, and this point is of particular relevance in dealing with the Daughters of God episode. In the discussion of stanza form we have seen that the original poet uses the 9-line stanza effectively in the drama at points of climax where the action is speeded up, and that this shorter stanza is not used (with one ineffective exception) in the Daughters of God redaction, the portion of the work which would logically contain the climax of the whole play. This technical fact is only one of many indications that the author of the Daughters of God redaction is an inferior dramatist. It is difficult to understand why a playwright who up to this point manifested such a fine feeling for suspense would, at the climax of his play, begin a pedestrian and verbose disputation and carry it on with practically no interruption for the final 520 lines, which is about one-seventh of the whole work.<sup>6</sup>

On the basis of the preceding analysis and also on the basis of other internal evidence, to be presented below, certain postulations can be made concerning the redactions of the *Castle of Perseverance* and the probable content of the original ending of the play. First, the vexillator redaction was made before the Daughters of God redaction; second, the original ending did not contain the Daughters of God episode; and third, the original ending consisted of a scene in which the Blessed Virgin Mary alone interceded for man before God.

The first indications that a high degree of probability exists for these postulations are to be found in the vexillator passage. In their recital of the banns the flag-bearers summarize the plot of the play to their audience, and summarize it *in detail*, through the point where Mankind dies and his soul is being argued for by the good and bad angels. The outcome of the drama, naturally, is not given. A hint, however, is present:

For at hys laste ende of mercy he gan spell,  
 & þerfore of mercy schal he nowth mysse;  
 & oure lofly lady, if sche wyl for hym mell,  
 be mercy & be meny in purgatory he is

In Ful byttyr place.

(ll. 122-26)

The hint is that the Virgin Mary is to intercede. No mention is made of the Four Daughters of God, which is particularly significant

<sup>6</sup> The faultiness of the dramatic technique of the latter part of the play has been troublesome to at least one editor of the play and also to one student of the theater. See *Chief Pre-Shakespearean Dramas*, ed. Joseph Quincy Adams (Boston, 1924), p. 283, and Richard Southern, *The Medieval Theatre in the Round* (London, 1957), p. 212 ff.

since the banns up to this point have left nothing out of the summary. If Mary and not the Four Daughters of God was involved in Mankind's salvation, then the probability is strong that the composer of the vexillator passage wrote it originally for a version of the play that had an entirely different ending from the one in the Macro collection. The question of why the old banns were not rewritten to fit the new plot cannot be answered, but the situation is not unusual in the history of mediaeval drama, as is evident in the well-known banns of the Hegge plays, which contain a summary not in accord with the body of the cycle that has come down to us.

Employing the same criteria we used to separate the three parts of the play from each other, we find one complete stanza and also a number of portions of stanzas in the Daughters of God episode which could possibly be the work of the writer of the original play. Some of these lines could have originally been the lines of the Virgin Mary, and some of them could have been spoken by God. Logically enough, the lines which were probably Mary's have been given over to Mercy in the Daughters of God scene. Those which were probably God's in the original are actually spoken by Him in the redaction. A particularly significant passage in one of the speeches which could be attributed originally to Mary is the conclusion of st. 288:

he hathe ben ful sory  
punchyd in purgatory  
for all the synnys seuene.

(ll. 3338-40)

It is to be remembered that the banns, in summarizing the plot of the play, indicate that Mary will intercede for man during his stay in purgatory. Furthermore, this latter reference to purgatory does not logically fit into the Daughters of God ending. At the beginning of this redaction the bad angel, after ordering Mankind to spring onto his back, exits with the words: "Haue good day, I goo to Helle" (l. 3129).

It is revealing to read consecutively all the lines, with emendations for references to her,<sup>7</sup> which can be attributed to Mary. Reading them in this manner makes clear that the poetry of these lines is not only different from but is superior to the poetry in the rest of the Daughters of God scene, and also that the subject matter of these lines is most appropriate to the Virgin Mary as intercessor before God:

<sup>7</sup> The emendations for Mary's speeches, in brackets in the quoted passages, are [Mary] for *Mercy*, [me] for *mercy*, and [Mary] for *mercy*. The one emendation in God's speech is [me] for *see*.

a mone I herd of *mercy* meve  
 & to me [Mary] gan crye & call (ll. 3130-31)

O þou fadyr of mytys moste,  
*mercyful god in trinite*,  
 I am þi dowter, wel þou woste,  
 & [me] fro heuene þou browtyst fre.  
 schew me þi grace *in euery coste*,  
 in þis cas my counforte be.  
 lete me, lord, neuere be loste  
 at þi jugement, whov-so it be,

of Mankynde.

Ne had mans synne neuere *cum in cas*,  
 I, [Mary], schuld neuere *in erthe* had plas;  
 þefore graunte me, Lord, þi grace,  
 þat Mankynde may me fynde. (ll. 3315-27)

& mercy, Lord, haue on þis man,  
 aftyr þi *mercy* þat mekyl is,  
 vn-to þi grace þat he be tan  
 of þi *mercy* þat he not mys (ll. 3328-31)

as þou art kyng of heuene.  
 For werldly veyn glory  
 he hathe ben ful sory,  
 punchyd *in purgatory*  
 for all þe synmys seuene. (ll. 3336-40)

but xxx<sup>ti</sup> wyntyre here, & more,  
 bowndyn & betyn & al to-schent,  
 scornyd & scovrgyd, sadde & sore,  
 & on þe rode rewly rent (ll. 3345-48)

Those lines of God in the redaction which can logically be attributed to the original poet are the following:

for man on molde halt welthe & wele,  
 lust & lykyng in al hys lyfe,  
 techyng, prechyng, in euery sele,  
 but he forgetyth þe lord be-lyve.  
 hye of hert, happe & hele,  
 gold & syluyr, chylde & wyf,  
 denteth drynke at mete & mele,  
 vnnethe [me] to panke he cannot kyth (ll. 3289-96)

kyng, kayser, knyght, & kamyoun,  
 pope, patriarch, prest, & prelat in pes,  
 duke dowtyest in dede be dale & be down,  
 lytyl & mekyl, þe more & þe les (ll. 3612-15)

This new information concerning the original content of the *Castle of Perseverance* is the most obviously significant result of the separation of the redactions from the original portion of the play. However, there are two other results of importance. The first deals with the light that the findings throw on the historical development of the morality play in England, and the second deals with the elimination of obscurities which would have continued to prevent solution of the problem of place and date of the *Castle of Perseverance*.

The *Castle of Perseverance*, when the original ending is taken into consideration, becomes more representative than any other extant morality of the native form at an early and uncorrupt stage of its development. If there is one obvious weakness in the play as it stands in the Macro collection, that weakness lies in the ending. Up to the Daughters of God episode the action moves in a series of effective scenes toward the climax. However, in the extant form of the play, the action ceases just at the point of climax. And then, for over five hundred lines to the end of the work, the play is extended in length by means of a dogmatic and actionless debate. If, however, an ending can be visualized in which, after Mankind's death, the tender figure of the Blessed Virgin approaches God and simply and prayerfully beseeches Him to forgive, then the denouement becomes one of sincerity and simplicity, one more in keeping with the feeling of the preceding portion of the play.

The alteration which took place by means of the substitution of the Daughters of God episode is clear evidence that the morality play followed in general the same patterns of change evident in the plays of the great mystery cycles, patterns typified largely by movements from simplicity to verbosity, and from directness to excessive didacticism. In the *Castle of Perseverance* the process of change can be seen taking place.

Linguistic analysis of the Macro *Castle of Perseverance* results in three significant findings concerning the location and date of the play. First, analysis discloses a number of dialectal features which allow the establishment of a specific location for the work. Second, it becomes clear that all three portions of the play are of the same provenance. And third, a further number of philological characteristics become obvious enough to allow the establishment of fairly accurate dates for all three portions of the play.

What first becomes apparent in the light of linguistic study is that the language in its broad features is typically East Midland: OE *ā* appears consistently as *o*; modern English 'shall' and 'should' appear with initial *sch* [ʃ]; object pronouns, 3rd pl., are always *hem*; the 3rd sg. pres.

indic. ending of verbs is *-(y)th*; the pres. part. ending is *-yng(e)* (with only 3 exceptions out of 109 forms, and these in the redactions).

However, closer analysis discloses some fifteen consistent dialectal features characteristic of the North, features so persistent that there can be no doubt that the provenance of the play is the Northeast Midlands. Lexically, there are 65 individual forms, many of them used repeatedly, which can be said to have been characteristic of the northern dialects in the Middle Ages (41 of the forms are either of Scandinavian origin or represent developments due to Scandinavian influence). Morphologically, the salient characteristics are the predominant use of *ar(e)(n)* for the 3rd pl. pres. indic. of 'to be', and the consistent use of *-yn(-en)* as the ending of the past participle of strong verbs.<sup>8</sup> Some of the important phonological features are: sounds which are apparently the result of Scandinavian influence (such as the retention of the diphthong [ei] in *bleykyn*, etc.); *k* for Midland *ch*; [e:] for OE *i* in open syllables; the dual development of late OE *ē + ȝ* or *h* to [e:] and [i:].

There is no linguistic evidence to indicate possibility of origin in any county farther north, such as Yorkshire, nor any to suggest a location anywhere in the West. Furthermore, a number of the dialectal features in the language are especially peculiar to the north Midlands, or, even more significantly, to the northeast Midlands. Lincolnshire must be the county in which the *Castle of Perseverance* originated.

The obvious question arises: just where in that large shire was the play created? It is logical to say, on linguistic grounds, that the *Castle of Perseverance* could not have come from the southern portion of the county, for the northern features are too persistent and have not begun to give way to the Midland patterns. On the other hand, it is not possible that the work could have come from any area very far in the North, for there are none of those obvious characteristics in the language which were peculiar to Scots or, at least in part, to the dialect of Yorkshire, such as the rounded form of OE *ō* (*gude*, etc.), *qw-* for OE *hw-*, initial *s* in 'shall' and 'should'. A point somewhere about halfway between the northern shore of the Wash and the Humber River would, on linguistic grounds alone, be a safe supposition — in short, the city of Lincoln or its environs.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>8</sup> See Samuel Moore, *Historical Outlines of English Sounds and Inflections*, rev. Albert H. Marckwardt (Ann Arbor, 1951), p. 123: "The ending of the past participle of strong verbs [in the northern dialects] was *-en* (never *-e*)."

<sup>9</sup> See Smart, pp. 42-49. Smart suggests that the Canwyke mentioned in the play (l. 2422) may be the village of Canwick situated a mile and a half southeast of the city of Lincoln.

There is evidence other than linguistic which points to Lincoln as the original home of the play. The content of the play in its original form was highly intellectual, manifesting a clear and refined control over much of the significant psychological, religious, and philosophical thought of the Middle Ages, and the work is learned also from the point of view of form. As we have seen from the analysis of the redactions, the original poet had almost perfect control over language and prosody, and errors even of a grammatical nature are difficult to find. And finally, the original writer was a man not only of learning but of considerable talent (a fact obscured to a great extent by the imperfections of the redactions). The play must originally have been one of exceptionally fine balance and symmetry and appears to have been written by someone with a keen sense of drama. The *Castle of Perseverance* in its original state can only have originated in some center of culture and learning like Lincoln.<sup>10</sup>

As has been pointed out above, the linguistic analysis leaves no doubt that the two redactions are in the same specific dialect as the original portion of the play.

The task of dating the *Castle of Perseverance* is complicated by recognition of the fact that the manuscript consists of three parts written by three different authors obviously at three different times. However, the problem is not insoluble.

The same reasons concerning the intellectual quality of the original play that were offered to justify placing the old version of the *Castle of Perseverance* in a cultural center, such as a cathedral city, can appropriately be used in suggesting an early date. The play as it originally existed was typical of the English morality play at an early point in its development. It was simple and sincere, belonging in the same category into which Hardin Craig placed *The Pride of Life*, which was "in simple form the type of play that was dominant in England, that is, a play in which there is a contest for the soul of mankind. At a later time, when the practice of making morality plays had established itself, other allegorical themes and various modifications of the principal theme manifested themselves."<sup>11</sup>

Just what the first form of the English morality play was like or what the year of its beginning was cannot be established. The first English moralities seem to have been known as Paternoster plays, and such a play

<sup>10</sup> See E. K. Chambers, *The Mediaeval Stage* (Oxford, 1903), II, 377-379; also Hardin Craig, *English Religious Drama of the Middle Ages* (Oxford, 1955), pp. 348-349.

<sup>11</sup> Craig, p. 348.

is mentioned by Wyclif about 1378 as existing at York. And at Lincoln, documents refer to a Paternoster play as given at various dates from 1397 to 1521. All these plays, according to Chambers, have been lost.<sup>12</sup>

It would not seem improbable, then, that the *Castle of Perseverance* in its original form was created before the end of the fourteenth century. There is considerable linguistic evidence that such a supposition is valid.

By fifteenth century standards the language of the *Castle of Perseverance* is consistently conservative. It shows little or no levelling toward the developing *schriftsprache*. The language of the play lacks not only many of the features which were characteristic of the language of London early in the fifteenth century but also many of those characteristic of the dialect of Yorkshire in the same period.<sup>13</sup> There are no *th-* forms for the 3rd pl. obj. pronoun in the manuscript, but these forms were appearing in London early in the century. The *-n* ending for the infinitive apparently had dropped in both London and Yorkshire in the same period, but there are 56 *-n* forms in the Macro play. Similarly, the transition of *ē* to *ī* was completed early in London, but it had not yet begun in the language of the *Castle of Perseverance*. It should be pointed out that all these features for dating are typical of the three portions of the play. There are no linguistic features which can validly be used to separate the parts from each other in time.

It does not seem unreasonable, however, to assume, in the light of the purity of content and form of the original version and also in the light of its linguistic conservatism, that the play was originally written some time before the turn of the century, perhaps in the latter half of the last decade of the fourteenth century.<sup>14</sup> As for the vexillator redaction, it could not have come much later. It was written for the original play, which it may be supposed, was after a run of a season or two, along with the not unusual appurtenances of flag-bearers and banns, taken on the road. For this redaction a date of from 1398-1400 does not seem early.

<sup>12</sup> Chambers, II, 436.

<sup>13</sup> See Wilhelm Dibelius, 'John Capgrave und die englische Schriftsprache', (*Anglia*, XXIII, XXIV, 1901), and Agnes Peitz, 'Der Einfluss des nördlichen Dialektes im Mittel-englischen auf die entstehende Hochsprache' (*Bonner Studien zur englischen Philologie*, XX, 1933). By establishing with the aid of these two studies the times that various features were developing both in London and in Yorkshire, and then by comparing these usages with the corresponding ones in the *Castle of Perseverance*, it becomes possible to arrive at fairly reliable conclusions concerning the dates for the Macro play.

<sup>14</sup> A not incredible hypothesis would be that the original version of the *Castle of Perseverance* is the "lost" Paternoster play recorded as having been given at Lincoln in 1397-98. See Chambers, II, 378.



And finally, the sameness of language does not permit a date much later than 1400 for the *Daughters of God* redaction. The play had had showings for a few years, and, it can be assumed, a change was thought to be called for. It was an age of apocrypha for mediaeval drama. The plot of the *Daughters of God* was near at hand; that theme seems to have been indigenous to Lincoln since the days of Bishop Grosseteste.<sup>15</sup> For the *Daughters of God* redaction, a conservative estimate is 1402-1405.

*Eastern Illinois University*

<sup>15</sup> See Hope Traver, *The Four Daughters of God*, Bryn Mawr Monographs, No. 6 (Philadelphia, 1907), pp. 125 and 162-163.

# A Twelfth Century Oxford Disputation Concerning the Privileges of the Knights Hospitallers \*

JAMES A. BRUNDAGE

## I

**P**RIVILEGES and exemptions of various kinds granted to religious orders were a perennial source of trouble for the medieval papacy and a significant part of the legal history of the medieval Church is concerned with such privileges. Decretals bestowing favors, litigation attacking them, apologies defending them and attempts to thwart the intention of these grants abound in the legal literature of the period. Among the religious orders of the twelfth century, the Knights Hospitallers, together with the Knights Templars and the Cistercians, were especially well favored recipients of papal grants of privileges. Beginning with the grant of papal protection bestowed on the Hospitalers by Paschal II in 1113,<sup>1</sup> dozens of twelfth century decretals extended the privileges enjoyed by the Knights. They were commissioned to collect alms,<sup>2</sup> they were exempted from the payment of tithes and other taxes of various descriptions,<sup>3</sup> particularly on noval lands and on lands worked directly by them and their servants,<sup>4</sup> they were granted lucrative rights of burial in their cemeteries,<sup>5</sup> those who maltreated them were subject to excommunication,<sup>6</sup> their enemies were forbidden to lay hands on them or their possessions,<sup>7</sup> their oaths were conceded special evidential

\* I should like to express my thanks to Professor Stephan Kuttner, who has kindly read this paper in manuscript and has made a number of helpful suggestions and improvements in the text.

<sup>1</sup> *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum*, ed. P. Jaffé, S. Loewenfeld, F. Kaltenbrunner, and P. Ewald, 2 vols. (Graz, 1956), 6341 [hereafter cited as JL].

<sup>2</sup> JL 9931, 10872, 11458, 15357.

<sup>3</sup> JL 15139, 15140, 15554, 15565, 15626, 15759, 15766, 15757, 15842, 15889, 16244.

<sup>4</sup> JL 14117, 14526, 15589.

<sup>5</sup> JL 11106, 13963, 15347, 15351, 15510, 16172.

<sup>6</sup> JL 13548, 13743, 16868.

<sup>7</sup> JL 15561.

value in the courts,<sup>8</sup> their benefactors were granted indulgences,<sup>9</sup> their members were forbidden to leave the order,<sup>10</sup> and the brethren of the order were declared exempt from excommunication or interdict by any bishop, archdeacon, or other ecclesiastical prelate.<sup>11</sup> Further, the Knights saw their privileges and possessions confirmed on numerous occasions during the century.<sup>12</sup> It is true, however, that despite the great number and variety of privileges which they enjoyed, the Knights occasionally had resort to forgery to better their position or to strengthen the claims which they legitimately enjoyed.<sup>13</sup> Occasionally, too, the Knights had to be reminded to respect the rights of their diocesan ordinaries and to observe some moderation in the assertion of their privileged position.<sup>14</sup>

The decretals granting power, possessions, and privileges to the Hospitallers were well known to the canonists of the late twelfth century and many of these papal letters were incorporated in the collections of *Extravagantes* which began to appear at the end of the century.<sup>15</sup> Disputations in which the provisions of these decretals were discussed also occurred upon occasion in the schools of canon law of this period.<sup>16</sup> One such disputation, hitherto unpublished, concerning the Hospitallers' privilege of immunity from excommunication will be reported here.

## II

The account of this disputation occurs in MS Royal 9 E. VII of the British Museum, folio 191<sup>ra</sup>, lines 1-38. The *quaestio* concerning the

<sup>8</sup> JL 17276.

<sup>9</sup> JL 15545; N. Paulus, *Geschichte des Ablasses im Mittelalter vom Ursprunge bis zur Mitte des 14. Jahrhunderts*, 3 vols. (Paderborn, 1922-23), I, 204.

<sup>10</sup> JL 13889.

<sup>11</sup> JL 13745.

<sup>12</sup> JL 9930, 10897, 11586, 12241, 13960, 13961, 13972, 14511, 15130, 15308, 15455, 15551, 15629, 15856, 15896.

<sup>13</sup> JL 7451, 16082, 16082a.

<sup>14</sup> JL 13961, 16573.

<sup>15</sup> Thus Bernard of Pavia included fifteen decretals dealing with the Hospitallers in the *Compilatio Prima*: Comp. I (ed. E. Friedberg, in *Quinque compilationes antiquae*, Graz, 1956) 3. 26. 10; 3. 26. 22; 3. 27. 1; 3. 28. 8; 3. 33. 16; 5. 28. 3-8; 5. 33. 7; 5. 34. 13-14; 5. 39. 10. John of Wales included four decretals dealing with the Hospitallers and their affairs in the *Compilatio secunda*: Comp. II. 3. 11. 2; 3. 18. 2; 3. 26. 2; 5. 14. 2. These decretals represent only a little more than 1 % of the material included in these two *compilationes*: the *Comp. I* includes a total of 912 capitula, of which those concerned with the Hospitallers account for 1.6 %, while the *Comp. II* includes a total of 330 items, of which the material concerning the Hospitallers represents 1.2 %.

Hospitallers is the first of fifty-seven disputations which are briefly reported on folios 191<sup>v</sup>-198<sup>r</sup> of this manuscript, which is variously known as the *Quaestiones Londinenses* or the Royal *Quaestiones*. The disputations reported here apparently took place in the Oxford schools, probably during the last decade of the twelfth century, for various events which occurred in the years 1191-96 are discussed in them. Since there is no mention of Pope Innocent III and since none of his decretals are cited in the disputations, it is very probable that the disputations occurred before 1198 or 1199 at the latest. Several Oxford masters are named in the disputations, including Master Nicholas de l'Aigle,<sup>17</sup> Master Simon of Derby,<sup>18</sup> another Master Simon who is probably Simon of Southwell,<sup>19</sup> Master John of Kent,<sup>20</sup> a rather shadowy Master Gregory,<sup>21</sup> and Master John of Tynemouth,<sup>22</sup> whose name is attached to the *olutio*

<sup>16</sup> One such disputation is reported by Gérard Fransen, 'Les 'Questiones' des canonistes (II),' *Traditio*, XIII (1957), 484, no. 14.

<sup>17</sup> Nicholas de Aquila (or de l'Aigle) became Dean of Chichester in 1197 and later was elected bishop. S. Kuttner and E. Rathbone, 'Anglo-Norman Canonists of the Twelfth Century,' *Traditio*, VII (1949/51), 320; A. B. Emden, *Biographical Register of the University of Oxford to A. D. 1500*, 3 vols. (Oxford, 1957-59), I, 560.

<sup>18</sup> Simon of Derby appears as a witness to a number of charters relating to the affairs of the bishops and chapters of Lichfield and Lincoln in the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries. Kuttner and Rathbone, 'Anglo-Norman Canonists,' p. 320; Emden, *Biographical Register*, I, 571-72.

<sup>19</sup> Simon de Siwelle or Southwell became a canon and prebendary of Lincoln Cathedral ca. 1184 and later appears as a member of the court of St. Hugh of Avalon, Bishop of Lincoln, and of Archbishop Hubert Walter of Canterbury. He was a papal judge delegate between 1191 and 1198 and later became a canon and treasurer of the chapter of Lichfield Cathedral. Kuttner and Rathbone, 'Anglo-Norman Canonists,' pp. 317-18, 320, 326; Emden, *Biographical Register*, III, 1704; C. R. Cheney, *English Bishops' Chanceries, 1100-1250* (Manchester, 1950), pp. 11, 13, 158.

<sup>20</sup> John was rector of Appledore in Kent, a member of Archbishop Hubert Walter's household, a royal justice, and possibly the author of two lost treatises, one a *Summa de poenitentia*, the other a work on the *Decretum Gratiani*. Kuttner and Rathbone, 'Anglo-Norman Canonists,' p. 320; Emden, *Biographical Register*, II, 1037; S. Kuttner, 'Pierre de Roissy and Robert of Flamborough,' *Traditio*, II (1944), 494, n. 9.

<sup>21</sup> Kuttner and Rathbone, 'Anglo-Norman Canonists,' p. 320, tentatively identify him either with Master Gregory of London, author of the *Mirabilia Romae*, or possibly with the otherwise unknown *Gre.* who is cited in the *Summa Quamvis leges seculares*; cf. Emden, *Biographical Register*, II, 817.

<sup>22</sup> John of Tynemouth lectured at Oxford at the end of the twelfth century, when Thomas Marleberge, later to become Abbot of Evesham, was one of his students. John later became a canon and prebendary of Lincoln Cathedral ca. 1206 and was archdeacon of Oxford between 1215 and 1221. He was also at one time a clerk of Archbishop Hubert Walter's household and served as a papal judge delegate ca. 1210. He is thought to have died ca. 1221. Kuttner and Rathbone, 'Anglo-Norman Canonists,' pp. 317-27; Emden, *Biographical Register*, III, 1923; Cheney, *English Bishops' Chanceries*, pp. 11-14, 20, 129, 158.

to the question involving the Hospitallers and to one other question in the manuscript.<sup>23</sup>

The manuscript of the Royal *Quaestiones* is written in a late twelfth or early thirteenth century hand. The folios measure approximately 32 cm. by 22 cm. and are ruled in double columns whose dimensions average roughly 9.5 cm. by 27.5 cm. The columns are set approximately 1 cm. apart and are variously ruled, with from 61 to 83 lines each. The eight folios of the manuscript may have been written by a single hand, although the variations which occur in the use of Roman and Arabic numerals and the wide variations in the forms of abbreviations might seem to suggest that several individuals were responsible for copying this manuscript. The *reportationes* give the impression of having been taken down as notes from oral disputations: such errors as 'Solempnus' for 'Solemus,' 'possit' for 'post,' 'nimirum' for 'nimium,' 'benignus' for 'benignius,' 'puppublicatum' for 'publicatum,' 'fidem' for 'fundum,' 'epic-tione' for 'evictione,' 'mutas' for 'mutus,' 'procelare' for 'procellere,' and 'condicionis' for 'condiciones' would seem to support this conclusion. The text has been corrected and revised in a contemporary hand and there are frequent elisions and deletions in the manuscript which indicate that a serious attempt was made to produce a reliable text. The manuscript is listed in the British Museum's Catalogue of this collection as "Cases in Canon Law." Of its provenance little is known, save that the manuscript belonged at one time to the Benedictine abbey of St. Augustine at Canterbury. Several of the masters whose disputations are reported in this manuscript are also referred to in the glosses of another late twelfth-century manuscript, MS 676 (283) of Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge.<sup>24</sup>

### III

The case in point here is the first of the *Quaestiones* in the Royal manuscript. The issues discussed in this disputation involve the interpretation of a privilege which was granted to the Knights Hospitalers by Pope Alexander III (1159-81). The text of the privilege is preserved in an undated decretal which was included in the *Compilatio*

<sup>23</sup> *Quaestio* 35: fol. 195<sup>ra</sup>, line 28 to fol. 195<sup>rb</sup>, line 11.

<sup>24</sup> Kuttner and Rathbone, 'Anglo-Norman Canonists,' pp. 317-27; S. Kuttner, *Repertorium der Kanonistik, I: Prodrum corpus glossarum* Studi e Testi, vol. 71 (Citta del Vaticano, 1937), pp. 251-52; W. Ullmann, *Medieval Papalism* (London, 1949), pp. 200-1; Sir George F. Warner and Julius P. Gilson, *Catalogue of Western Manuscripts in the Old Royal and King's Collections*, 4 vols. (London, 1921), I, 295.

*Prima*, compiled by Bernard of Pavia about 1191. The text of the decretal, which is directed to the "Bishops, Archdeacons, and other prelates of the churches established throughout Gaul," reads:

Sane quoniam a predecessoribus nostris et a nobis statutum est, ut ipsos excommunicare uel oratoria sua interdicere nemini liceat, uobis presentium auctoritate iniungimus, atque precipimus, ut predictos fratres hospitalis Ierosolimitani aut ecclesias suas interdicere uel excommunicare nullatenus presumatis.<sup>25</sup>

The *quaestio*, then, postulates this set of facts: an armed band of Hospitallers have forced their way into a church, where they attacked and beat the clergy attached to the church and expelled them from the sacred precincts. The local bishop, in retaliation, has denounced the guilty Hospitallers as excommunicates and they, in turn, have laid a complaint against the bishop for violating their privilege of immunity from excommunication.

The argument upholding the Hospitallers' complaint is based on the premise that since the power to excommunicate the Hospitallers is, according to their privilege, implicitly reserved to the pope, so also the power to denounce them as excommunicates must likewise be reserved implicitly to the pope, since the denunciation carries with it the stigma and some of the effects of excommunication itself. Thus, it is argued, the Hospitallers' privilege would be of no use to them if it were possible for bishops to denounce them as excommunicate. Since it was for the purpose of safeguarding the Knights from the effects of excommunication that the pope granted them this privilege in the first place, the argument concludes that the bishop's action must be invalid because it is an attempt to defeat the purpose which the legislator had in mind when he awarded the Knights this privilege.

The opposing argument postulates a distinction between the act of laying a person under excommunication and the act of denouncing a person as excommunicate. It is argued that it is permissible for a person

<sup>25</sup> *Comp. I*, 5. 28. 8 (X—) = JL 13745. For the date of *Comp. I*, see W. Plöchl, *Geschichte des Kirchenrechts*, 3 vols (Munich, 1953-58), II, 416-17; H. E. Feine *Kirchliche Rechtsgeschichte I: Die Katholische Kirche* (Weimar, 1955), p. 252; S. Kuttner, *Repertorium der Kanonistik (1140-1234): Prodrum corpus glossarum*, I (Città del Vaticano, 1937), p. 322; A. M. Stickler, *Historia iuris canonici Latini, I: Historia Fontium* (Torino, 1950), p. 226. A. Vetulani has recently questioned the commonly accepted date and has suggested that 1187 is more likely; see his article, 'Deux intéressants manuscrits de la 'Compilatio Prima', *Traditio*, XII (1956), 605-11. The early history of *Comp. I* has also been recently discussed by G. Fransen, 'Les diverses formes de la 'Compilatio prima', *Scrinium Lovaniense* (Louvain, 1961), pp. 235-53 (brief summary in *Traditio*, XVII (1961), 547).

to make known a fact even though the person who makes the fact known has not the power to cause the fact to exist. Thus the bishop may denounce the guilty Knights as excommunicates, even though he lacks the power to place them under excommunication. It is further argued that, had the pope so desired, he could have forbidden bishops either to excommunicate Hospitallers, or to denounce them as excommunicate, or both. But since the privilege which was in fact given to them only forbids bishops to excommunicate members of the order, it is contended that hence the pope implicitly recognized the bishop's right to denounce the Hospitallers as excommunicate.

The Oxford master who disputed this case was evidently no partisan of the Hospitallers' privileged position: John of Tynemouth's *solutio* states his conclusion baldly: "Bene potuit eos denunciare."

*Quaestiones Londinenses*

London. British Museum. Royal 9 E. VII, fol. 191<sup>r</sup>-198<sup>v</sup>

*Quaestio, I*

folio 191<sup>ra</sup> lines 1-38

TEXT

Hospitalariis indulsit papa<sup>1</sup> huiusmodi priuilegium vt nullus archiepiscopus<sup>2</sup> possit eos excommunicare.<sup>3</sup> Quidam hospitalarii armata manu irruente in quamdam ecclesiam clericos eius verberatos eiecerunt. Episcopus loci denunciat eos excommunicatos. Conqueruntur de episcopo quia in priuilegium eorum deliquerat. Quod non possit episcopus excommunicatos denunciare, sic: Solus papa potest episcopum pro crimine deponere vel <iudicare et> [MS indicare], vt 3. Q. 6. Quamuis.<sup>4</sup> Solus etiam episcopum absolutum et purgatum potest denunciare, adeo quod si a papa <absolutus> [MS absolutum] ad propria redierit sine litteris pape absolutariis [*sic* !] non habebitur pro absoluto et purgato, vt 8. Q. vltima, c. vltimo.<sup>5</sup> Cum ergo, vbi papa sibi reseruatur specialiter alicuius absolutionem, idem reseruatur sibi absolutionis denunciationem, ergo et vbi reseruatur sibi excommunicatione et excommunicationis denunciatione<m>. Contrariorum<sup>6</sup> enim eadem est ratio, vt D. xxi, Inferior, Denique.<sup>6</sup> Item eque<sup>7</sup> punitur qui carmen famosum componit et qui inuentum publicat, vt V. q. i. c. j. et vltimo.<sup>7</sup> Ergo eque puniendus est qui

<sup>1</sup> Alexander III (1159-81).

<sup>2</sup> Apparently this represents a misreading of the salutation of the decretal, which bears the address: "Episcopis, Archidiaconis et aliis ecclesiarum prelati per Galliam constitutis."

<sup>3</sup> *Comp. I* 5. 28. 8. *Sane quoniam* (X—).

<sup>4</sup> C. 6. q. 4. c. 6. *Quod bene*.

<sup>5</sup> C. 8. q. 5. c. un. *Quilibet fratrum*.

<sup>6</sup> D. 21. c. 4. *Inferior sedes*, and c. 6. *Denique si*.

<sup>7</sup> C. 5. q. 1. c. 1. *Qui in alterius*, and c. 3. *Si qui inuenti*.

perperam denunciatur et perperam excommunicatur. Item si cui conceditur excommunicare, eidem conceditur et excommunicationem denunciare: arg. ff de <seruitutibus> [MS: furti] rusticorum prediorum;<sup>8</sup> item <sic> possunt § habet; l. 3 de iudiciis, § Quamvis, § Sententiam.<sup>9</sup> Ergo interdicto hoc <interdicitur> [MS: intenditur] id: arg. 4. q. 3, Sane quod super.<sup>10</sup> Item C. de rebus alienis non alienandis, Sancimus, in fine.<sup>11</sup> Quia sepe prohibetur aliquid propter consequens ex eo, vt 22. q. j. In nouo;<sup>12</sup> D. 37, Ideo.<sup>13</sup> Ita et hic papa prohibet hos excommunicare propter id quod ex eo sequitur, scil. communicat<sup>a</sup>tionem eorum vitari. Item antecedentis expositione. Quid enim aliud [corr. ex aliquid] est excommunicare quam excommunicationem ponere, anathematizare quam separare, vt 24. q. 3 [MS: 2. (2 corr. ex 3)4. 2], Certum est.<sup>14</sup> Set tunc potissimum a communione separatur quis quando denunciatur, vt <24> [MS: 2. 4] Q. 2, Sane quod super.<sup>15</sup> Item attendenda est mens priuilegium concedentis, 16. q. j, Generaliter, in fine; <sup>16</sup> ff de <constitutionibus> [MS: legibus], Beneficium.<sup>17</sup> Item si licet episcopo eos denunciare, infructuosum foret eis priuilegium. Sicut enim antequam indubium erat priuilegium poterat episcopus eos excommunicare de facto passim pro libito suo et teneret sententia, <ita> [MS: itera] et nunc potest eos passim excommunicato denunciare dicendo, licet falso, eos incidisse in canonem et ob hoc se eos excommunicatos denunciare. Constat autem quod huiusmodi dolos voluit dominus papa inhibere, ut <...> § Affirmo quod nihil <ominus> [MS: nomius] non licuit episcopis nec alio modo eis liceret, arg. <14.> [MS: ix] q. 3, Plerique;<sup>18</sup> ff de questionibus, l. j. § Cum quidam;<sup>19</sup> ff pro socio, Idemque erit;<sup>20</sup> C. de liberis naturalibus, Legem Anastasii, in finem.<sup>21</sup>

Contra. Infirmum est argumentum et, si consequens concessio hoc conceditur id, ergo interdictio hoc interdicitur id. Nam cui conceditur maius et minus non eum cui tollitur maius et minus, vt x. q. vltima, c. j,<sup>22</sup> et pleniter. Secus est in admonendo quam in concedendo, vt ff de alimetiis legatis, Legatis;<sup>23</sup> ff de transactionibus,

<sup>8</sup> Dig. 8. 3. 3. 3.

<sup>9</sup> Possibly *Comp. I. 1. 21. 7*, 8. *Quamvis simus*, (= X 1. 29. 6) et infra: *Sententiam* (X—) = JL 14156. Professor Kuttner reminds me that the reference to "liber 3" shows that the *Coll. Tanner* (Bodleian MS Tanner 8) is being used here. The reference is to *Coll. Tanner* 3. 3. 10, 12 (= liber IV in Professor Holtzmann's analysis of the MS; cf. Kuttner and Rathbone, 'Anglo-Norman canonists,' p. 340, no. 5).

<sup>10</sup> Probably C. 24. q. 2. c. 3. *Sane quod super*.

<sup>11</sup> *Cod.* 4. 51. 7.

<sup>12</sup> C. 22. q. 1. c. 3. *In nouo testamento*.

<sup>13</sup> D. 37. c. 15. *Ideo prohibetur*.

<sup>14</sup> C. 24. q. 3. c. 9. *Certum est*.

<sup>15</sup> C. 24. q. 2. c. 3. *Sane quod super*.

<sup>16</sup> C. 16. q. 1. c. 40. *Generaliter*.

<sup>17</sup> Dig. 1. 4. 3.

<sup>18</sup> C. 14. q. 3. c. 3. *Plerique refugientes*.

<sup>19</sup> Dig. 48. 18. 1. 18.

<sup>20</sup> Dig. 17. 2. 16. pr.

<sup>21</sup> *Cod.* 5. 27. 7.

<sup>22</sup> C. 10. q. 3. c. 1. *Placuit ut nullus*.

<sup>23</sup> Dig. 34. 1. 6.



Cum hij, § Qui transigit.<sup>24</sup> Item duo prorsus diuersa et a se inuicem discreta sunt excommunicare <et> denunciare; arg. ff de acquirendo, Ad ea, § Cum quis.<sup>25</sup> Ergo licet altero concessio concedatur et reliquum non immo si tollatur alterum et regulam vt in Inst. de [repeated and deleted in ms. : de] legatis, § Si quis ancillas<sup>26</sup> Item licet cui factum ostendere cui non licet id facere, vt ff de furtis, Si quis in seruitute;<sup>27</sup> ff quod vi aut clam, Prohibere.<sup>28</sup> Item excommunicatum a suo episcopo potest aliquis alius episcopus denunciare excommunicatum: xi, q. iii, Curc.<sup>29</sup> Item potest quis excommunicatum denunciare qui non potest eum excommunicare vt xix, Anastasius;<sup>30</sup> arg. igitur c. vltima de penitentia;<sup>31</sup> ff j. § Hoc titulo.<sup>32</sup> Item priuilegium non se extendit nisi quatenus in dubium est, vt 6, q. j, Visis, in fine;<sup>33</sup> 9, q. 3, Idem questus.<sup>34</sup> Item iure communi licet episcopus excommunicare omnes parochianos suos. In adeptione huius potestatis non contra est expressio in priuilegio. Alioquin id solum videtur adeptum de quo est expressum; ff de iudiciis, <Solemus> [MS: Solempnus];<sup>35</sup> ff de procuratoribus, 1. Mutus, § Cum queritur;<sup>36</sup> lib. j, de iudicis potestate, Pervenit.<sup>37</sup> Item cum duo licuerit pontifici excommunicare et denunciare alterum prohibendo rem videtur papa indulsisse; arg. ff de iudiciis, Cum pretor;<sup>38</sup> D. xxv, Qualis.<sup>39</sup>

Solutio <Johannis de Tyneumth> [MS: Jo. de thi]:<sup>40</sup> Bene potuit eos denunciare.

### *University of Wisconsin*

<sup>24</sup> Dig. 2. 15. 8. 12.

<sup>25</sup> Dig. 41. 1. 7. 7.

<sup>26</sup> Inst. 2. 20. 17.

<sup>27</sup> Dig. 47. 2. 7. pr.

<sup>28</sup> Dig. 43. 24. 3.

<sup>29</sup> C. 11. q. 3. c. 20. *Curae sit omnibus.*

<sup>30</sup> D. 19. c. 9. *Anastasius.*

<sup>31</sup> D. 7. de pen. c. 6. *Nullus expectet.*

<sup>32</sup> Not identified.

<sup>33</sup> C. 16. q. 2. c. 1. *Visis.*

<sup>34</sup> Perhaps C. 9. q. 3. c. 8. *Conquestus.*

<sup>35</sup> Dig. 5. 1. 61.

<sup>36</sup> Dig. 3. 3. 43. 1.

<sup>37</sup> *Comp. I. 1. 21. 13. Pervenit ad nos (X—).*

<sup>38</sup> Dig. 5. 1. 12.

<sup>39</sup> D. 25. c. 4. *Qualis.*

<sup>40</sup> For John of Tynemouth (Jo. de thi.) see above, p. O, n. 22.

# The Mediaeval Medical School at Cambridge\*

VERN L. BULLOUGH

HASTINGS Rashdall called mediaeval Cambridge a "third rate university." He found it hard to produce the name of a prominent ecclesiastic who had studied there prior to the middle of the fourteenth century and could not find a "single doctor in decrees or in medicine" during the same period. He argued that it was only as a result of the growth of the Wyclifite heresy at Oxford that Cambridge came into fashion; its numbers then grew rapidly until by the end of the fifteenth century it equalled Oxford in student population.<sup>1</sup> Rashdall's statements for theology at Cambridge have since been labeled as "too sweeping,"<sup>2</sup> but no attempt has been made to examine his assessment of the Cambridge medical school both for itself and as compared to Oxford. This is such an attempt based on printed sources<sup>3</sup> which might serve as a guide to further MSS study.

The earliest physician to appear in the Cambridge records is Nigel de Thornton (Thorndon) who founded the office of university chaplain

\* Research assisted by a grant-in-aid from the American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia, Pa.

<sup>1</sup> Hastings Rashdall, *The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages*, new edition revised by F. M. Powicke and A. B. Emden (Oxford, 1936), III 284-85.

<sup>2</sup> By the editors of the revised edition, *Ibid.*, III, 284, note 2.

<sup>3</sup> Such a study is difficult because neither the statutes nor the available references make much mention of medicine. The classical history of Cambridge, Thomas Fuller, *The History of the University of Cambridge and of Waltham Abbey* (originally published in 1651 but more easily available in the edition edited by James Nicholas, London, 1840) has only chance references to medicine. George Dyer, *A History of the University of Cambridge* (2 vols., London, 1814) is primarily concerned with a later period. The most helpful is J. B. Mullinger, *The University of Cambridge from the Earliest Time to the Royal Injunctions of 1535* (Cambridge, 1873). Documents relating to the University and town were translated by Charles Henry Cooper, *Annals of Cambridge* (4 vols., Cambridge, 1842-53), and vol. 5 by J. W. Cooper (Cambridge, 1908), henceforth *Annals*. The statutes of the university and colleges were printed in *Documents Relating to the University and Colleges of Cambridge* (3 vols., London, 1852), hereafter cited as *Documents*. Others were printed by [James Heywood], *Early Cambridge University and College Statutes* (London, 1840). Occasional references can be found in the various college histories and Grace Books which I have cited where pertinent. No specialized study has been made of the mediaeval Cambridge medical school, although there are some references in Humphrey Davy Rolleston, *The Cambridge Medical School: A Biographical History* (Cambridge, 1932), and R. T. Gunther, *Early Science in Cambridge* (Oxford, 1937). Most valuable in attempting to locate the various medical graduates has

some time before the year 1279.<sup>4</sup> Venn claims him as a graduate of Cambridge with an M. D. degree, but such an assertion can only be conjecture. The fact that it is not until the middle of the fourteenth century that any other Cambridge students can be identified as having medical interests tends to weaken Venn's claim. The next possible medical student is John de Stockton, a fellow of Peterhouse in 1339. His name appears on the flyleaf of one of a group of medical MSS bound under the title of Gilbertus Anglicus, *Compendium medicinae*.<sup>5</sup> The same MS had also been used as a pledge by M. William de Pykeward on Feb. 5, 1341, at Cambridge. The possession of a medical MS, however, especially one of Platearius, does not establish a medical school.<sup>6</sup> Almost equally as tenuous is the case of Simon de Holbech (died 1335) who is listed as a fellow and scholar of Peterhouse on the inscription of a thirteenth and fourteenth century collection of medical treatises.<sup>7</sup> Holbech had probably earned an M. A. degree at Oxford,<sup>8</sup> and is known to have later studied medicine and perhaps received a medical degree. The fact that he was listed as being at Cambridge and that he gave medical manuscripts to both Oxford and Cambridge might indicate that he studied medicine at the latter institution. That some type of medical study was available at Cambridge during this period is indicated by the fact that a John Martyn, "scholar of Peterhouse," received permission from Bishop Montacute to study medicine.<sup>9</sup> Martyn was succeeded in his fellowship by William Lowgton in 1350, but Lowgton probably did not study medicine because the Peterhouse statutes stipulated that only one student at a time study medicine,<sup>10</sup> and in that same year Richard D. Outheby was admitted to fellowship to study

been the *Alumni Cantabrigienses*, *A Biographical List of All Known Students, Graduates, and Holders of Office at the University of Cambridge, from the Earliest Times to 1751*, edited and compiled by J. and J. A. Venn (Cambridge, 1922-27), henceforth *Alumni Cantabrigienses*, and also some of the biographical histories of the various colleges.

<sup>4</sup> Cooper, *op. cit.*, I, 66, and Venn, *op. cit.*, IV, 232.

<sup>5</sup> Montague Rhodes James, *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of Peterhouse* (Cambridge, 1899), pp. 72-73.

<sup>6</sup> T. A. Walker, *A Biographical Register of Peterhouse Men* (Cambridge, 1927), I, 10, mistakenly reads "mag. Johis de Stokes doctoris in medicina," for John de Stockton from the listing in James. He thus makes Stockton an M.D. This might well be the case but the Stokes in the inscription might also be a later figure. On the printed evidence I am unwilling to identify them as the same man.

<sup>7</sup> James, *op. cit.*, p. 166.

<sup>8</sup> See A. B. Emden, *A Biographical Register of the University of Oxford* (3 vols., Oxford, 1957-59), II, 945. Walker, *op. cit.*, I, 8, would claim him for Peterhouse.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, I, 9.

<sup>10</sup> See below.

medicine.<sup>11</sup> Outheby is the earliest doctor of medicine graduating from Cambridge that I can find. He is definitely listed as a "*doctoris in medicina*" from Peterhouse on a collection of thirteenth and fourteenth century MSS in the Peterhouse library.<sup>12</sup>

Outheby's fellowship was not filled at Peterhouse again until 1400 and the remaining references to medicine during the fourteenth century come from other colleges. William Rougham, M. D., was one of five fellows of Gonville Hall in 1351, and its master from 1360 to 1393.<sup>13</sup> He is listed as a bachelor of medicine on a 1363 petition to the pope,<sup>14</sup> but from which institution he received his degree is difficult to determine. If he acquired his medical training at Gonville, his example was not widely followed by his successors; in the surviving list of fellows over the next seventy years his was the only name with any possible medical affiliation.<sup>15</sup> John Teesdale, fellow of Michaelhouse towards the end of the fourteenth century,<sup>16</sup> gave five medical manuscripts to the University Library which were listed in the catalogue of 1424.<sup>17</sup> Whether he was actively engaged in the study and practice of medicine is difficult to say, but the nature of his collection would seem to indicate more than a passing interest in the subject.

The same sprinkling of medical references occurs during the first half of the fifteenth century. John Fayr (Fairy) was admitted as a fellow to Peterhouse in 1400 where he combined holy orders with the study of medicine and eventually received the M. D. degree.<sup>18</sup> John Somerset (Somersets, Somerseth) had been a scholar of arts at Oxford until an epidemic had forced him to migrate to Cambridge. He was a fellow of Pembroke College in 1410 and later became both a bachelor and a doctor of medicine, probably of Cambridge. He was physician to Henry VI, Chancellor of the Exchequer, and one of the commissioners who drafted the statutes for Cambridge in 1449. He was also the owner of several medical MSS which ended up in the various college libraries of Cambridge and Oxford.<sup>19</sup> William Hatteclyff (Hattclyffe) was one

<sup>11</sup> Emden, *op. cit.*, I, 13.

<sup>12</sup> James, *op. cit.*, p. 117.

<sup>13</sup> John Venn, *Biographical History of Gonville and Caius College, 1349-1897* (Cambridge, 1897), I, 2. Henceforth cited as Venn, *Biographical History*.

<sup>14</sup> *Calendar of Entries in the Papal Registers, Petitions to the Pope A.D. 1342-1419*, vol. I, edited by W. H. Bliss (London, 1896), p. 406.

<sup>15</sup> Venn, *Biographical History*, pp. 1-5.

<sup>16</sup> *Alumni Cantabrigiensis*, IV, 211.

<sup>17</sup> Henry Bradshaw, *Collected Papers* (Cambridge, 1889), pp. 29-30.

<sup>18</sup> Walker, *op. cit.*, p. 30. He was the successor to Outheby.

<sup>19</sup> Emden, *op. cit.*, III, 1727-28.

of the first fellows appointed to King's College in 1440-41. By 1454 he had become the royal physician and a doctor of medicine; he somehow survived service under both the Yorkist and Lancastrian monarchs.<sup>20</sup> Roger Marshall was admitted as a foundation fellow to Peterhouse in 1437-38, and proceeded to the degree of M. D. He was later physician to King Edward IV.<sup>21</sup> Several other students possessed medical MSS,<sup>22</sup> which might indicate that they were students of medicine.

By the second half of the fifteenth century, however, the number of identifiable medical graduates, both bachelors and doctors, noticeably increases. I have been able to identify over fifty such graduates, an average of about one a year, which seems to have been the norm.<sup>23</sup> None of the group achieved much of a continental reputation, although some, such as Lewis Caerleon, were known in several fields.<sup>24</sup>

Sir Humphry Davy Rolleston, in his history of the Cambridge medical school, stated that James Fries (Freis) was the first recorded M. D. active at Cambridge. Fries was resident at Cambridge in 1460, but Rolleston felt that the first M. D. degree was not given until a few years later when a M. Lemester received the degree in 1466-7.<sup>25</sup> This is obviously not the case, for Outheby had received the degree at least a century earlier, and others had also obtained the degree before 1460. From the records it does appear, however, that Cambridge always used the term doctor rather than that of master to apply to its graduates in medicine, although the two might well have been interchangeable.

Extant statutes would also seem to indicate a late fourteenth century beginning for medical study, since the earliest surviving statute references probably date from that period.<sup>26</sup> The provisions, with one exception, are fairly standard for mediaeval medical universities. The candidate for the M. D. degree must have served as a regent in the Arts, i.e. achieved the M. A. degree, and then attended lectures for five years in medicine at Cambridge or some other university, and have practiced for two years.<sup>27</sup> The reference to some other university is important,

<sup>20</sup> Walker, *op. cit.*, pp. 42-43.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 43, and *Alumni Cantabrigiensis*, III, 148.

<sup>22</sup> For example, William Goldston, Walker, *op. cit.*, p. 31.

<sup>23</sup> Rather than name the men here, some 53 all told, I plan to do a monograph on medical practitioners in mediaeval England.

<sup>24</sup> Pearl Kibre, 'Lewis of Caerleon, Doctor of Medicine, Astronomer, and Mathematician,' *Isis*, XLIII (1952), 100-8.

<sup>25</sup> Rolleston, *op. cit.*, p. 2.

<sup>26</sup> The statutes are in *Documents*. The section on medicine is believed to have been derived from the proctor's book written about 1398, *Ibid.*, I, 306.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*, I, 375.

and unusual, since most of the major continental schools discouraged transfer students.<sup>28</sup> Such a provision might well indicate that many students did part of their medical studies at other schools before candidating for a degree at Cambridge.

Included in the statutes are a list of books and provisions about study. The books include the *Johanitius*,<sup>29</sup> *De Pulsibus* of Philaretus, *De Urinis* of Theophilus, the various books on diets, fever, and urine of Isaac Judaeus, the *Viaticum*,<sup>30</sup> the *Antidotarium* of Nicholas, and Galen's *Tegni*, *Prognostics*, *Aphorisms*, and *De Regimine Acutorum*. Galen's works and the *Antidotarium* were to be heard twice with commentaries. Students were also to give cursory lectures on a book of theory and one on practice, and oppose and respond in public on them. All masters of the faculty were to agree on the candidate's fitness before he was admitted to the degree.<sup>31</sup>

The enumerated books are very similar to a list which Charles Homer Haskins attributed to Alexander of Neckam (Nequam) (1157-1217), and which he believed was used at Paris in the thirteenth century.<sup>32</sup> The fact that Cambridge had not added to the list by the end of the fourteenth century indicates that it was somewhat behind the continental schools, since it leaves out such common mediaeval texts as Hippocrates, Dioscorides, and others mentioned by Neckam or in the statutes of other medical universities.<sup>33</sup>

While no further list of medical books appears in the mediaeval statutes, there are other references to medical MSS at Cambridge which can add to the picture of medical study there. One of the lists is that of John of Teesdale, fellow of Peterhouse, who donated some five medical manuscripts to the University Library and which are listed in an extant catalogue of 1424.<sup>34</sup> In addition to some of the previously cited works, the list includes those of Hippocrates, Averroes, John of

<sup>28</sup> See for example my 'Mediaeval Bologna and the Development of Medical Education,' *Bulletin of the History of Medicine*, XXXII (1958), 201-15.

<sup>29</sup> I have not identified most of the authors since they are fairly well known. *Johanitius* is the Latin term for *Isagoge in artem parvam Galeni* of Honeien ben Ishak, one of the earliest works translated from Arabic into Latin.

<sup>30</sup> The *Viaticum* was translated by Constantine the African from the work of Ibn el-Jezzar, a pupil of Isaac Judaeus.

<sup>31</sup> *Documents*, I, 375.

<sup>32</sup> Charles Homer Haskins, *Studies in Mediaeval Science* (Cambridge, Mass., 1924), pp. 356 ff. Haskins found the list in a Gonville and Caius College MS but I feel that it is not indicative of Cambridge at that early date.

<sup>33</sup> See my 'The Mediaeval Medical University at Paris,' *Bulletin of the History of Medicine*, XXI (1957), 208-10.

<sup>34</sup> Bradshaw, *op. cit.*, pp. 29-30.

Damascene, Avicenna, Giles of Corbeil, Serapionis, and Rhazes.<sup>35</sup> A copy of Gilbertus Anglicus was also in use at Cambridge by 1341,<sup>36</sup> while Simon of Holbeck gave to Peterhouse at this time additional copies of Damascene, Avicenna, Averroes, and Giles of Corbeil.<sup>37</sup> Richard D. Outheby also left works of Rhazes, Averroes, and Avicenna to Cambridge during the fourteenth century,<sup>38</sup> while John of Somerset added Avicenna and Galen in the fifteenth century. Somerset also wrote a medical treatise entitled *Liber Niger Scaccarii*.<sup>39</sup>

The most complete list of books in the Cambridge library dates from the year 1473.<sup>40</sup> Included in the 330 books are some nineteen titles dealing with medicine. In addition to the works and authors already cited, the list contains the *Passiones messway* and the *Addiciones mesue*,<sup>41</sup> a work by Johannes Alexandri,<sup>42</sup> and several commentaries, questions, and expositions on medicine. But even with this list the Cambridge Library had only the nucleus of the basic medical works of an earlier period, and was not keeping up with the newer works.<sup>43</sup> This tends

<sup>35</sup> In primis liber in quo continetur Galienus de complexionibus Galienus de malicia complexionis Joh<sup>es</sup> Damascenus de inpressionibus in alto quid' tractatus Galienus de simplici medicino Galienus de creticis diebus Galienus de Crisi Galienus de interioribus... Item liber in quo continentur Galienus super pronostica ypocratis Commentum eiusdem super libro ampho<sup>rum</sup> ypocratis Expositio super librum regimenti acutorum morborum ypocratis Galienus de ingenio sanitatis... Item liber in quo continentur tres libri canonis Auicenne cum libro Serapionis... Item Rasis in Almasorio cum sunt diuisiones Rasys Antitadarius Rasys de dolore capitis Rasys de passionibus uicturarum De passionibus puerorum Idem liber experimentorum cum expositione difficilium dictionum Rasys in Almasorio... Item liber in quo continentur Galienus de morbo et Acti<sup>o</sup> Amphoris<sup>1</sup> damasceni cum commento ysodori solectorium Aueroy Libellus Aueroy de tirriatis Auicenna de viribus cordis et medicinis cordialibus Cantic<sup>o</sup> Auicenna cum com<sup>to</sup> Aueroy liber 4<sup>tus</sup> methe<sup>orum</sup> Egidius de vrinis cum commento...

<sup>36</sup> James, *op. cit.*, p. 73.

<sup>37</sup> Holbeck, who died in 1335, left the documents to Walter of Barton with instructions to pass them on to Cambridge. *Ibid.*, p. 166.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 117-118.

<sup>39</sup> Emden, *op. cit.*, III, 1727-38.

<sup>40</sup> Bradshaw, *op. cit.*, pp. 35-53.

<sup>41</sup> Probably a reference to the works of Mesue the Younger, although several miscellaneous works went under the name of Mesue.

<sup>42</sup> I have been unable to identify this person and his works might not even be medical. Petrus de Crescentiis and Palladius, both of whom wrote on husbandry are included among the medical works so that the listing of Alexander does not necessarily mean that he was a medical writer.

<sup>43</sup> Unfortunately, the titles of some 200 volumes given by Bishop Rotherham, Archbishop of York and Chancellor of the University are not extant. However, if his gift was anything like that of Duke Humphrey to Oxford, there would be little change in the medical library at Cambridge.

to strengthen Rashdall's claim as to the low standing of Cambridge as a medical school. Other statutory evidence gives further documentation for the existence of only a minimum faculty. For example, William Skelton of London received an M.D. at Cambridge in 1470-71, even though he lost his form *propter defectum doctoris legentis*. He was also excused from the necessary regency.<sup>44</sup>

Apparently also the Cambridge medical student often took the medical course without completing the basic work in the arts, or perhaps even took courses in medicine without intending to earn the medical degree. This phenomenon can be more easily documented at Oxford,<sup>45</sup> but the fact that the Cambridge Grace Book stipulated that students in medicine should attend lectures in the arts,<sup>46</sup> serves to indicate that not all medical students, in spite of the statutes, held the M. A. degree. There are several medical graduates who later went on to earn other degrees. Thomas Bowd, for example, after acquiring his degree in the arts went on to earn both medical and divinity degrees.<sup>47</sup> A master Lowes who acquired his degree of bachelor of medicine in 1476 might also be the same Lowes who later earned a doctor of civil laws degree.<sup>48</sup> John Venetus was a doctor of divinity, but was also licensed to practice medicine,<sup>49</sup> indicating some medical study. There were probably others.<sup>50</sup>

As far as the colleges are concerned it seems that Peterhouse at Cambridge held a position similar to Merton at Oxford for attracting students interested in medicine, perhaps because Peterhouse was modeled after Merton by its founder.<sup>51</sup> The oldest extant statutes, those of 1344, stipulated that Peterhouse scholars were to hold the B. A. on election, after which they were to proceed to further study in the liberal arts until such time as they were granted permission to study theology. However, two contemporary fellows might study civil or canon law, and one was granted permission to study medicine.<sup>52</sup> The

<sup>44</sup> *Grace Book A*, edited by Stanley M. Leathes, *Luard Memorial Series I* (Cambridge, 1897), p. 77. "Concessa est Magistro Wylllelmo Skelton vt forma perdita propter defectum doctoris legentis possit sibi stare pro completa forma ad incipiendum in medicinis et quod non artetur ad necessariam regenciam post inceptiorem suam."

<sup>45</sup> See my article, 'Medical Study at Mediaeval Oxford,' *Speculum*, XXXVI (1961), 600-612.  
<sup>46</sup> *Grace Book A*, p. 97.

<sup>47</sup> *Alumni Cantabrigiensis*, I, 107.

<sup>48</sup> *Ibid.*, I, 110.

<sup>49</sup> *Ibid.*, IV, 297.

<sup>50</sup> For example John Reynold, a doctor of canon law, who had some connection with St. Bartholomew's Hospital in London. *Ibid.*, III, 444.

<sup>51</sup> Rashdall, *op. cit.*, III, 295-96.

<sup>52</sup> Walker, *op. cit.*, p. 3. The provision about medical study appears in *Documents*, II, 22.



provision for medical study was not always taken advantage of, and there was probably a lapse of nearly fifty years at Peterhouse itself in the utilization of the medical fellowship.<sup>53</sup> The statutes at Clare Hall (founded 1359) also permitted one of the twenty fellows to study medicine.<sup>54</sup> The original statutes of Gonville College (founded 1349) allowed two of the twenty scholars to study medicine,<sup>55</sup> while Queens' College (founded 1448) went further and required two of the eighteen fellows to study civil law and medicine respectively.<sup>56</sup> In this last case the student in medicine had to proceed to the grade of doctor in his faculty (as did the other students) or face expulsion.<sup>57</sup> Time limits were set for acquiring the doctorate degree so that the expulsion could be carried out.

By the fifteenth century the positions of the university physicians in England were somewhat more secure with the result that they petitioned Parliament in 1421 to restrain anyone from practicing medicine who had not graduated from the universities or been approved by either Oxford or Cambridge. The Petition was granted and parliament ordered and decreed that the Lords of the King's Council should have authority to execute such ordinances as might seem meet and necessary.<sup>58</sup> At the Convocation of Clergy in that same year in St. Paul's London, the Archbishop of Canterbury, perhaps to strengthen the position of Oxford and Cambridge, stipulated that all patrons of benefices throughout his province could only present Doctors of Divinity, Decrees, Law, or Medicine, Masters of Arts, or Bachelors in the said faculties of Oxford and Cambridge as candidates. The Archbishop of York soon followed suit.<sup>59</sup>

Despite these assets, the medical faculty at Cambridge remained a minor one, and within the university it was overshadowed by the other faculties. Medicine was somewhat more important in the fifteenth century than it had been earlier at Cambridge, but even after 1450 there were not very many students. In summation, the mediaeval Cambridge medical school was no match for those on the continent, while in England it lagged behind Oxford.

#### *San Fernando Valley State College*

<sup>53</sup> Outheby for example was appointed a fellow in 1350. The next reference to a medical student is after 1400.

<sup>54</sup> *Statutes*, II, 159. This is clearly stated in one set of statutes but is not so clear in the other. See, *Ibid.*, II, 132.

<sup>55</sup> *Ibid.*, II, 226.

<sup>56</sup> *Ibid.*, III, 44.

<sup>57</sup> *Ibid.*, III, 45.

<sup>58</sup> *Annals*, I, 166-67.

<sup>59</sup> *Annals*, I, 167-68.

# Theos and the One in Some Texts of Plotinus

JOHN M. RIST

IT is a commonplace among students of ancient philosophy that the Greek word *θεός* is often misleadingly translated into English as "God." As Wilamowitz<sup>1</sup> observed, *θεός* in Greek is basically a predicative notion. Professor Grube<sup>2</sup> has rightly pointed out that a Greek who said "Love is god" would mean "first and foremost that it is more than human, not subject to death, everlasting." If we recognize this fact we should be wary of translating *θεός* as God (with a capital letter). There will, of course, be occasions where such a translation will be required, but we must proceed with caution.

In Plotinus, as in all Greek thinkers, the word *θεός* is of wider application than our word "god." It is in this light that we should consider passages like *Ennead* 6.9.8.8-9<sup>3</sup> where we read that souls become *θεοί* in virtue of a movement towards the One, for all that is joined with the One is *θεός*, and what stands apart from the One must be *ἄνθρωπος ὁ πολὺς καὶ θηρίον*. Thus souls become gods by associating themselves with the One, which is the source of divinity. The problem remains before us, therefore, that just as the One as the source of Being must itself be "beyond Being", perhaps we should believe that the One as source of divinity is to be thought of as "beyond divinity." If this were Plotinus' meaning, it would be most inexact to think of the One as either god or God.

Arnou suggested<sup>4</sup> that, since Plotinus speaks of a First Principle superior to νοῦς and calls it *ἐπέκεινα νοῦ* and *ἐπέκεινα γνώσεως* (5.3.12.47-48), we ought logically to suppose that he would have thought of the One as *ὑπέρθεος*, an expression which in the form *ὑπέρθεον πνεῦμα* occurs in the writings of Pseudo-Dionysius.<sup>5</sup> He adds that, although such language is absent from the *Enneads*, the idea occurs in 6.9.6.12-15. When

<sup>1</sup> U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, *Platon I* (Berlin, 1909) 348. "Denn Gott selbst ist ja zuerst ein Prädikatsbegriff."

<sup>2</sup> G. M. A. Grube, *Plato's Thought* (London, 1935 and Boston, 1958) 150.

<sup>3</sup> References in *Enneads* 1-5 will be to the text of Henry and Schwyzler, and in *Ennead* 6 to that of Bréhier.

<sup>4</sup> R. Arnou, *Le désir de Dieu dans la philosophie de Plotin* (Paris, 1921) 124.

<sup>5</sup> *Div. nom.* 2, 3-4. PG 3, col. 974, 640B, 641A.

we conceive the One, says Plotinus, as Mind or god (οἶον νοῦν ἢ θεόν), it is more than that; it is more than god (πλέον ἐστὶν ἢ θεός). Let us first remember, however, that this passage is unique in Plotinus. Nowhere else is the idea that the One is more than god stated in this clear fashion. And even here Plotinus does not say that the One is more than *the* God (ὁ θεός), but more than god (or perhaps God) —θεός. And let us also consider the context. Plotinus is trying to show that the One is more unitary and more absolutely itself than men can conceive. Such unity cannot be conceived (ἐνικώτερον τῆς σῆς νοήσεως). Again why does Plotinus associate the idea that the One is more than θεός with the idea that it is more than νοῦς? Almost certainly because here, as in many other parts of his work, he is struggling to free the First Principle of Platonism from its associations with an Aristotelian νοῦς. Both Albinus and Numenius had made such a νοῦς their First Principle, and against this view Plotinus constantly holds that νοῦς must involve a duality while the First Principle must be pre-eminently simple. Νοῦς and θεός were frequently associated in the Platonic tradition, and Plotinus himself is very willing to call his own νοῦς, the Second Hypostasis, θεός. But such a θεός is not the simple First Principle, though it is the simplest principle that can properly be conceived by man. Plotinus knows that intellectual knowledge of the First Principle is not possible. Only its presence can be deduced. Grasp of its simplicity is beyond the intellect, for the intellect can conceive it only in terms of its attributes, and any attribution of quality serves only to diminish its unity. Addition brings deprivation and deficiency (3.9.9.23).

In *Ennead* 3.4.2.15. Plotinus tells us that our life must be directed towards what is intellective, towards νοῦς and towards θεός. Here both νοῦς and θεός are used of the Second Hypostasis — as indeed they are in many other passages of the *Enneads*. Could it not be against some such understanding of θεός that Plotinus is protesting in 6.9.6? We know that Plotinus' predecessors frequently equated the words νοῦς and θεός. We know that in certain circumstances Plotinus is willing to accept this equation. Are we then to be quite certain that it is not against any such equation as descriptive of the First Principle that Plotinus is complaining in 6.9.6? Since this passage is unique, might we not think it possible that Plotinus is saying only that the One is more than θεός when θεός is the equivalent of νοῦς. This interpretation cannot be proved or disproved by the study of 6.9.6. alone, but an investigation of the ways in which Plotinus is prepared to use the word θεός of his First Principle should give us an indication of the more likely hypothesis. If Plotinus is very loath to call the One θεός, we can assume that he is thinking of it along the lines of Pseudo-Dionysius and would demand, if pressed, the application

to the One of the word *ὑπέρθεος*. If, however, we find *θεός* in regular use as a description of the One, then my suggestion that 6.9.6 means only that the One should not be thought of as *θεός* when *θεός* implies *νοῦς* and duality should be preferred.

Arnou is unwilling to admit without reservation that Plotinus calls the One God. "L'un est *θεός* quelquefois," he writes; though a little later he has to admit that "A vrai dire, le principe qui répond le mieux à nos idées sur la divinité, c'est l'Un..."<sup>6</sup> Professor Gilson,<sup>7</sup> following Arnou, tends to go further. "In some texts, which are few and far between, he (Plotinus) speaks of the One as of the Supreme God; but these are exceptional expressions... Which serves at least to show that, if the One is truly a God, the fact does not strike Plotinus as particularly important." Gilson cites three certain and one possible reference from the *Enneads* to demonstrate his position. He finds the One spoken of as the Supreme God in 1.8.2.25, 5.5.3.3-4, 5.5.9.16 and possibly 3.9.9.1.<sup>8</sup> In 1.8.2.25 and 5.5.9.16 the word *θεός* occurs; in 5.5.3.3-4 *νοῦς* is spoken of as a "second God," but the word is not expressly applied to the One, though it is likely enough that where there is a Second God there will also be a First. The text of 3.9.9.1 is hopelessly corrupt and little can be deduced from it. The emendation *θεός τὸ πρῶτον ἐπέκεινα ὄντος* given by Vitranga, Müller and Bréhier seems too difficult to afford much confidence. This passage then had better be left aside — which means that Gilson has produced only two passages which explicitly and unequivocally refer to the One as God or a God.

Arnou, whose authority Gilson follows, adds a number of others: 1.1.8.9, 5.1.6.9, 5.1.11.7, 5.5.11.12 (He gives the impression that there is only one reference in this chapter), 6.5.4.1, 6.5.12.33, 6.8.1.18-19, 6.9.9.20. All these passages refer to the One as God, except 6.5.12.33. Here Plotinus contrasts *οἱ θεοί*, the lesser gods who *παντοῖοι τελέθοντες ἐπιστροφῶσι πόλῃας*, with *ἐκεῖνος*, the One. Once again *ἐκεῖνος* may stand for *ἐκεῖνος θεός* (this will be discussed later), or conceivably it may not.

Thus if we state the case of Arnou and Gilson in terms of the passages they themselves quote, we may say that Plotinus calls the One "God" nine times, that there are two other passages where such a description is most likely, and one passage where a textual problem allows it as a possibility. If this were all the available evidence, the position adopted by Arnou and Gilson would be a strong one. Plotinus would apparently

<sup>6</sup> R. Arnou, *op. cit.* 125 note 13 and 128.

<sup>7</sup> E. Gilson, *Being and Some Philosophers*, 2nd ed. (Toronto, 1952) 28.

<sup>8</sup> *Op. cit.* 28, note 41.

attach little importance to the description of the One as God. Beside the multitude of other names, such as source, root, cause, Good, nine certain instances of the word *θεός* in the whole of the *Enneads* would seem very insignificant.

Yet there are many other passages in which Plotinus refers to the One as either *θεός* or *ὁ θεός*. I do not pretend to have an exhaustive list, but the following additional eleven examples of *ὁ θεός* and seven of *θεός* should sufficiently indicate the point. For *ὁ θεός* we have:

- (1) 1.6.7.9. *πᾶν ὅσoui ἀλλότριον τοῦ θεοῦ αὐτῷ μόνῳ αὐτὸ μόνον κ.τ.λ.* The notion of the "Alone to the Alone" must refer to the One. On this God everything is said to depend; even life and intellection.
- (2) 2.2.2.13. Here God is spoken of as that to which the soul clings in love. Everything depends upon it. It is hard to see how God here is not the One.
- (3) 2.2.2.22. God here is the One, as in (2). We have the common Plotinian idea that God is present everywhere, though not in any place. Soul can associate with him.
- (4) 2.9.9.48-49. Here *παρὰ τῷ θεῷ* and *μετ' ἐκείνῳ* both refer to the same hypostasis, namely the One.
- (5) 4.3.8.38. Here we are told that God is not limited and that soul resembles it in this respect, since it too has an infinitely possible power. For the One as *ὁ πεπερασμένος* we should compare *Enn.* 5.5.10.19.
- (6) 4.7.8<sup>3</sup>.11ff. In this passage Plotinus is dealing with the Stoics. He shows the problems that arise if God is treated in the same way as they treat *Νοῦς*. "God" is certainly something higher than the Divine Mind. Plotinus must therefore be thinking of the One.
- (7) 5.3.7.1. and (8) 5.3.7.2. Here, after asking in the previous chapter whether some kind of self-knowing is not obviously to be attributed to the Divine Mind, Plotinus raises the problem whether the alternative to such self-knowledge might be the contemplation of God. This God is said to have given to the Second Hypostasis, and to have power. It is referred to in line 5 as *ἐκεῖνος*. Plotinus must be thinking of the One.
- (9) 5.5.11.15 and (10) 5.5.11.17. I have already mentioned that Arnou found 5.5.11 a source for the account of the One as God. His text, however, gives the impression that the idea only occurs once in this passage. In fact, besides 5.5.11.12 — where the phrase quoted by Arnou occurs — the One is further called *ὁ θεός* in lines fifteen and seventeen.
- (11) 6.8.19.11. After speaking of God in this line, Plotinus explains his meaning in line thirteen by a reference to Him who is "beyond Being." This must be the One, who is thus equivalent to the God of line eleven.

In addition to the above, the One is referred to simply as *θεός* in the following seven passages of Bréhier's text.

- (1) 6.8.21.9. This whole chapter deals with the One. The One is spoken of as God without hesitation or any kind of second thought.
- (2) 6.9.5.3. Here the partisans of Chance are said to be far from *θεοῦ καὶ ἐννοίας ἐνός*. The One and God appear identical.

- (3) 6.9.9.16, (4) 6.9.9.27, (5) 6.9.9.34, (6) 6.9.9.56. From treatise 6.9.9. Arnou cited a single text (line 20). In fact there are four further occasions where the One is called God. The whole of the chapter concerns the relationship between the soul and the One.
- (7) 6.9.11.28. Here, in a passage much influenced by Numenius and descriptive of the final union of the One and the soul, the transcendent One is described as *ἐκεῖνος θεός*.

In addition there is a further passage where the reading is uncertain. At 6.9.7.29, where certainly the One is the object of discussion, Müller, Volkman and Bréhier read *οὗν θεός* and Vitringa *ὁ θεός*. Kirchhoff and Bouillet suggested that there is a lacuna in the passage, while Cilento translated the manuscript reading. I find the text as it stands very difficult, but it seems that the suggestion of *θεός* is arbitrary. I do not therefore propose this passage as evidence for the relation of the One to God.

The evidence so far presented almost trebles the number of passages in which Plotinus refers to the One as God. In my remarks about 6.9.11.28, I alluded briefly to Numenius. It is now necessary to examine his language about the Divine hypostases and to compare it with that of Plotinus. We may hope that the comparison will lead to further conclusions about the Plotinian One.

Numenius, according to Proclus, held that there are three Gods. He called the First "the Father," the Second "the Maker" and the Third "the Product" (*ποίημα*).<sup>9</sup> The First God is a *νοῦς*. It is well known that Plotinus was much influenced by Numenius. Porphyry tells us in his *Life of Plotinus* that various of his contemporaries actually accused Plotinus of plagiarizing the doctrines of his predecessor.<sup>10</sup> Numenius was read in the school of Plotinus<sup>11</sup> and there is no doubt that there are certain aspects of his thought which might have led the very unwary to assume that Plotinus had added nothing of his own. Although there are a number of passages in Plotinus which look like echoes of Numenius, the number is not very great. Yet Professor Dodds<sup>12</sup> has listed enough references to clinch the belief that Plotinus was seriously concerned to seek out what he

<sup>9</sup> Cf. the collection of Numenian fragments and *testimonia* prepared by E. A. Leemans under the title 'Studie over dem Wijsgeer Numenius van Apamea met Uitgave der Fragmenten,' *Mém. de l'Acad. roy. de Belgique, classe des lettres* 37, 2 (1937). The three Gods are discussed in *Testimonia* 24 and 25 (quotations from Proclus). Throughout the rest of this article, in references to Numenius, T. will stand for *Testimonia* and F. for *Fragmenta* in Leemans' collection.

<sup>10</sup> Porphyry, *Vita Plotini* 17.

<sup>11</sup> Porphyry, *op. cit.* 14.

<sup>12</sup> E. R. Dodds, 'Numenius and Ammonius', *Entretiens Hardt*, 5 (Vandœuvres-Genève 1960) 16-24.

thought to be correct in the Numenian theories and to reject what was erroneous, in particular perhaps what verged upon Gnosticism.

The most striking and well known verbal agreement between the two thinkers, as Dodds points out, is between fragment eleven of Numenius (ὁμιλῆσαι τῷ ἀγαθῷ μόνῳ μόνον) and such passages of the *Enneads* as 1.6.7.8, 6.7.34.7 and 6.9.11.50. Among other similarities Dodds compares Numenius' phrase ἐποχούμενον ἐπὶ τῇ οὐσίᾳ with the Plotinian ἐποχούμενον τῇ νοητῇ φύσει (1.1.8.9). Furthermore, as Dodds points out, the similarities between Numenius and Plotinus are not merely verbal. A comparison of *Enn.* 3.9.1. with *Enn.* 2.9.6 shows that in the latter essay Plotinus corrected a number of Numenian statements which he had favoured at an earlier period. In particular he rejects the Numenian distinction between the νοῦς ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ and the νοῦς θεωρῶν.

We may then be confident, first that Plotinus read Numenius, secondly that his own doctrines were similar enough to those of his predecessor to puzzle the short-sighted and make them suppose that they were not an original creation, thirdly that Plotinus regarded Numenius as a fairly important thinker. If there are verbal echoes of Numenius in Plotinus, we can assume that Plotinus knew Numenius' doctrines fairly well; in fact that he studied them. A casual reading would hardly give such acquaintance, and Porphyry tells us in chapter three of his *Life of Plotinus* that Amelius, the disciple of Plotinus who wrote out and arranged the works of Numenius, knew the majority of them by heart.

It is well known that the First Principle of Numenius — which he called the Father (T. 24) and the King (F. 21) — was a νοῦς (F. 25, 26). Yet despite this aspect of his thought — which was repugnant to Plotinus — we may wonder if there is any evidence that Plotinus would have been willing to employ Numenian terminology and call the One the First God. I must admit at once that I have been unable to find the phrase ὁ πρῶτος θεός in the *Enneads*. This might perhaps lead us to suppose that such a phrase would have seemed to Plotinus to be contrary to the principles of the negative theology. Yet there are a number of other passages which are worthy of further consideration. Henry and Schwyzler are right to make fresh mention in their edition of the *Enneads* (ad. loc.) that 3.5.6.18 is an allusion to the thought of Numenius. Here Plotinus tells us that it is customary to call the cosmos a Third God. Now where there is a Third it is natural to suppose there must be a Second and a First. As we have seen, there were such Gods for Numenius. Since Plotinus is willing to take over the Third God, what would he have made of the First and Second?

Here one might raise an objection: Is not *Ennead* 3.5.6.18 an allusion not to Numenius but to "Plato's" *Second Letter*? In the *Second Letter* we read (312E) that there are three Principles: the King of all, the Second

and the Third. "Plato," however, does not specifically call these Principles Gods. Furthermore the passage in 3.5.6.18 equates the Third God with the cosmos. Such an equation is not made by "Plato," but occurs in Numenius, where the Third God is called *ποίημα* (T.24). One might assume that Plotinus supposed that the Third Principle of the *Second Letter* was in fact the cosmos, but the evidence of *Enn.* 3.5.8.8 does not support this conclusion. Plotinus writes as follows: "We must take Plato as our guide, who says in the *Phaedrus* that Zeus is the great leader but elsewhere that this God is a Third. But in the *Philebus* he speaks more clearly..." The "elsewhere" appears to be a reference to the *Second Letter*. No other Platonic or supposedly Platonic text is suitable. Yet Plotinus feels that the *Second Letter* is not as clear as it might be about the precise role or nature of the Third Principle.

Furthermore the language of 3.5.6.18 does not give the impression that Plotinus is referring to the *Second Letter* at all. He remarks that the cosmos, "as it is customary to say" is a Third God. This sounds more like a reference to a contemporary or near-contemporary mode of thinking than a reference to Plato. It is not impossible that Numenius himself was influenced by the *Second Letter*— The use of the word "King" in F. 21 is slight evidence for this — and that the influence of the letter thus came down to Plotinus both directly and through Numenius; but it seems most likely that Numenius is the immediate source of 3.5.6.18. When Plotinus refers to the letter directly, he very frequently quotes Plato's own words, without using the term God.<sup>13</sup>

Before finishing with this point we may recall that Dodds<sup>14</sup> has observed that Plotinus makes use of the word *ἀγλαΐα* to describe the splendour of the Intelligible World. This word has been revived by Numenius to describe the Good. Although *ἀγλαΐα* does not occur in 3.5.6, we find the adjective *ἀγλάον* in 3.5.8.16 — immediately after the reference to the *Second Letter*. Could this description of the splendour of the soul be an indication that Plotinus read his *Second Letter* with thoughts of Numenius in his mind?

Assuming therefore that Plotinus could think of a Third God on partially Numenian lines, what are we to suppose that he would have thought of Numenius' terms First God and Second God? Perhaps some sort of answer to this can be given by a consideration of *Ennead* 5.5.3. Plotinus opens this section with the dogma that *Νοῦς* is a great God, a Second God

<sup>13</sup> Cf. *Enn.* 1.8.2.28-32, 5.1.8.1-4. Although the quotation is not direct, the word God does not occur in 3.9.7.

<sup>14</sup> *Op. cit.* 18.



that makes itself manifest before the Supreme appears. In 3.5.6.18 we found a Third God — probably influenced by Numenius. Here we have a Second God, and that Second God is the Divine Mind. As after a Third one must expect a Second, so here after a Second one might expect a First. After a Second *God* one might hope to find a First God, but again Plotinus tantalizingly declines to use the word “God.” The problem is then: Are we justified in assuming that the absence of the phrase “First God” is the result of a deliberate refusal by Plotinus to employ it? Or is it merely coincidence here that he remains satisfied with the word *ἐκεῖνος*? Again are there any Numenian echoes in this chapter? If there are, they might strengthen the belief that the term First God would not be unsatisfactory to Plotinus — always provided of course that its transcendence was assumed. If in a chapter where he appears to be influenced by Numenius, Plotinus speaks of a Second God — as Numenius had done — we should not be going beyond the bounds of probability to suggest that in respect of the term God, Plotinus found nothing exceptionable in Numenius’ usage.

In *Ennead* 5.5.3 we again find the image of the One as King, which echoes the *Second Letter*, or Numenius (F. 21) or both. Furthermore, Numenius speaks of *πᾶσι τοῖς συντεταγμένοις* in F. 21, and *Ennead* 5.5.3.19-20 tells us that the One is lord of a *θείου συντάγματος*. F. 21 and *Ennead* 5.5.3 both call the First Principle Father, though this is commonplace; less common is *προπάτωρ* (5.5.3.24) and *πάππος* (T. 24). These verbal resemblances are perhaps not of great significance, yet they point in the same direction as does our more general argument; in the direction, that is, of seeing Plotinus normally willing to use Numenian terminology.

Finally we must look at *Ennead* 6.9.11. In this treatise no-one would dispute that there is an obvious verbal echo of Numenius. The phrase *φυγή μόνου πρὸς μόνον* of line fifty-one echoes the *ὁμιλῆσαι τῷ ἀγαθῷ μόνῳ μόνον* of Fragment 11, and, although Dodds<sup>15</sup> is right to play down the significance of the echo, it is hard not to suppose that both Plotinus and his readers would have had Numenius in mind. Whatever may have been the metaphysical differences between Numenius’ and Plotinus’ use of this phrase — and they certainly were considerable — Plotinus was probably less conscious of them than we are. With his great ability to read his own doctrines into the works of his predecessors, he probably saw Numenius’ use of *μόνος μόνῳ* as not very different from his own. Indeed I suspect that when writing of the flight of the Alone to the Alone, and of union with the One in general, he may well have used more Numenian

<sup>15</sup> *Op. cit.* 17.

terminology than we are aware of. We should certainly look about to see if there is any more to be found.

With this in mind, we should perhaps not suppose it totally insignificant that a phrase occurs in line twenty-eight which may echo Numenian terminology on the subject of the First Hypostasis. This is the phrase *ἐκεῖνος θεός*, meaning undoubtedly "That Supreme (Transcendent) God" namely the One. We have already noticed that it is not uncommon for the One to be called God, and it is well known that Plotinus continually refers to Him as *ἐκεῖνος*, but *ἐκεῖνος θεός* is most unusual. It looks very like the equivalent of the Numenian *πρῶτος θεός*. The more speculative might be prompted to wonder on how many of the occasions when Plotinus calls the One *ἐκεῖνος*, he means *ἐκεῖνος θεός*, and in particular whether such contrasts as *οὗτοι μὲν θεοί ... εἰς ἐκεῖνον δὲ* (6.5.12.30-33) mean "these gods... that God" (Bréhier translates *εἰς ἐκεῖνον* as "vers le dieu suprême"), but this must remain forever beyond the possibility of proof. More immediately significantly, perhaps, is the passage in 5.5.3 we have already examined. Here we have *δεύτερος θεός* contrasted with *ἐκεῖνος*. It seems that at least we can say that if on this occasion Plotinus did not understand *θεός* with *ἐκεῖνος*, he would not feel it impossible for it to be understood there. 6.9.11.28 makes it certain that *ἐκεῖνος θεός* is a description of the One that he was willing to accept.

To sum up the conclusions reached so far, we can say that Arnou's remark that the One is God "sometimes" is seriously misleading. The number of passages where the One is God is almost treble that offered by Arnou. Furthermore it seems likely that the description of the First Principle as God given by Numenius was largely acceptable to Plotinus. The One is *πλέον ἢ θεός* if *θεός* is a Numenian *νοῦς*, but if it is not, then the One may properly be called *θεός*. In what sense Plotinus understood the One as God, must be temporarily deferred.

\*  
\* \*

Arnou has reminded us<sup>16</sup> that Origen makes use of a number of verbal means to distinguish the First and Second Persons of the Trinity. Origen's descriptions of the Logos are often comparable with Plotinus' descriptions of *Νοῦς*. In 1.2.6 Plotinus speaks of *αὐτοδικαιοσύνη* and in 5.9.13 of *αὐτοάνθρωπος*. Similarly, as Arnou points out, Origen calls the Logos *αὐτοδύναμις*, *αὐτοβασιλεία*, *αὐτοδικαιοσύνη*. He refuses, however,

<sup>16</sup> *Op. cit.* 121, especially note 2.

to give it the name *αὐτοθεός*. That is reserved for God the Father.<sup>17</sup> This raises the question whether it might be possible to derive any help from Origen on the problem of the use of the word God in Plotinian descriptions of the One.

Apart from the word *αὐτοθεός* — which is not paralleled in Plotinus — Origen has two further verbal means of distinguishing the First two Persons of the Trinity. In at least three passages of the *Contra Celsum* (5.39, 6.61, 7.57) he distinguishes the Second Person, the Logos, as *δεύτερος*, and in agreement with this refers in 6.61 to God the Father as *ὁ πρῶτος θεός*. Here we see language similar to that of Numenius. It may safely be assumed that such phrases were a part of the philosophical or theological jargon of the day. The phrase *δεύτερος θεός*, as we have seen, recurs in Plotinus, and I have suggested that perhaps he might not find *πρῶτος θεός* objectionable. With this in mind we can proceed to the second of Origen's ways of describing the first two Persons of the Trinity. In his *Commentary on St. John*<sup>18</sup> he informs us that one may speak of God the Father as *ὁ θεός*, and of the Logos as *θεός*. Thus although both the Father and the Logos are God, they can be distinguished — and in a subordinationist theology like Origen's the Father can be shown to be superior — by the use of the definite article.

Can any parallel to this usage be found in Plotinus? It should be stated at once that Plotinus feels able to use *ὁ θεός* both of the One and of the other hypostases, and is similarly free with *θεός*. Yet within this apparent carelessness of terminology there will perhaps appear a little design. As far as I can see, Plotinus refers to the One as *ὁ θεός* on fifteen occasions in all — these have been discussed above — and as *θεός* on another eleven.<sup>19</sup> At first sight these figures may appear non-significant, but we should look further, and in doing so ask ourselves why Origen used the definite article to refer to the First Person of the Trinity. Surely the answer is that such a usage distinguishes the First from the Second. One might suppose then that the Origenist phrase *ὁ θεός* is almost equivalent to *ille deus* or *ἐκεῖνος θεός*. If it is evident from the context which Person one is discussing, the use of the article would seem less essential. This canon will perhaps shed light on Plotinus. Let us look at the eleven occasions when he calls the One simply *θεός*.

<sup>17</sup> *Comm. in Johan.* Book 2, edit. Preuschen, p. 54.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>19</sup> *ὁ θεός* occurs in 1.1.8.9, 1.6.7.9, 1.8.2.25, 2.2.2.13, 2.2.2.22, 2.9.9.48, 4.3.8.38, 4.7.8<sup>3</sup>.11, 5.3.7.1, 5.3.7.2, 5.5.11.12, 5.5.11.15, 5.5.11.17, 6.5.4.1, 6.8.19.11. *θεός* occurs in 5.1.6.9, 5.1.11.7, 5.5.11.12, 6.8.1.18-19, 6.8.21.9, 6.9.5.3, 6.9.9.16, 6.9.9.20, 6.9.9.27, 6.9.9.34, 6.9.9.56, 6.9.11.28.

- (a) 5.1.6.9. Here Plotinus uses the phrase *θεόν αὐτόν*. We have already noticed that in Origen *αὐτοθεός* is used for the Father only. Similarly the Plotinian "God himself" would naturally point to the First Hypostasis. An article would hardly be necessary to make this clear.
- (b) 5.1.11.7. Here the One is spoken of as *τὴν τοῦ ἀρχῆν καὶ αἰτίαν καὶ θεόν*. Even if the article with *ἀρχήν* is not to be understood also with *αἰτίαν* and *θεόν*, a reader would have little difficulty in identifying the One with *νοῦ θεόν*.
- (c) 5.5.11.12. This is perhaps the most difficult example. Plotinus speaks of the soul as being *ἐρημος θεοῦ* if it wastes its time on transitory appearances. Yet in the immediately preceding lines he has been referring to the God one seeks as the *ἀρχὴ τοῦ εἶναι* and declaring it to be superior to Being. It is hard not to think that the reference to the One in *ἐρημος θεοῦ* is crystal clear and that Plotinus would have felt no obligation to emphasize it. Nevertheless the passage is a little difficult.
- (d) 6.8.1.18-19. *ἐπὶ θεοὺς καὶ ἔτι μᾶλλον ἐπὶ θεόν*. Here the One is distinguished by the sense from the plurality of lesser divinities.
- (e) All the remaining passages in 6.8 and 6.9 need little comment. The topic throughout these tracts is the One, and it would be unnatural to refer the word *θεός* to anything else. Throughout the two tracts there appears to be only one use of the word *θεός* in the singular which does not refer to the One and that is in the passage of 6.9.8 (discussed at the beginning of this article) where whatever is joined to the One is said to be made *θεός* by the association (*θεός γὰρ τὸ ἐκείνῳ συνημμένον*).

We may conclude the present argument then with the tentative suggestion that, although Plotinus is very far from a rigid distinction of *ὁ θεός* and *θεός* as descriptive of the One and *Νοῦς* respectively, yet there are indications that he is beginning to move in that direction. *ὁ θεός* is used of the One fifteen times. When *θεός* is used instead, the context makes it very obvious which hypostasis is being discussed. There are, of course, a number of occasions where *ὁ θεός* is used of a lower hypostasis (e.g. 3.5.1.20, 4.8.1.47) and this makes it certain that Plotinus did not feel any necessity to be rigid in this matter. Yet it seems that the evidence presented here is indicative of the fact that Plotinus both accepted the equation of the One with God, and at times attempted to demonstrate the superiority of the divinity of the One to that of the other hypostases by methods which were familiar in his day: both by the use of the article and by marking off the Divine Mind clearly as a *Second* God, as Numenius and Origen had done. If the One is not explicitly the First God in Plotinus, it is both *God* and the *First* Nature (*Enn.* 6.9.7.16).

In *Ennead* 6.8.15 Plotinus tells us that the One is *Ἐρως*. We know, of course, that love exists in the Real World and that like other Real Beings its ultimate cause is the One. The attitude of Plotinus to the One as God is similar to that on the One as Love. Just as all loves derive ultimately from the One as Love, so all divinity derives from the One as God.

Θεός γὰρ τὸ ἐκείνω συνημμένον. Hence it is misleading to state, as does Professor Gilson, that "If the One is truly a God, the fact does not strike Plotinus as particularly important."<sup>20</sup> On the contrary Plotinus speaks of the One as God far more than some of his interpreters have supposed. It is as important for Plotinus that the One is God as that he is Cause and Love. It is important to see the limits of the negative theology as Plotinus uses it. He says frequently that the One is "beyond Being" and "beyond Essence." Hence it is itself neither Being nor Essence. Yet we should not apply the same reasoning to the idea of the One as Cause. The One is not "beyond Cause." Rather it is in a sense Causation itself. Without the One as Cause there could be no causation in the world; without the One as Love there could be no love; without the One as God there could be no divinity. And Plotinus would regard the critic whose views suggested that the world is not divine as a blasphemer.

*University College, Toronto.*

<sup>20</sup> *Op. cit.* 28.

# The Porretans and the Greek Fathers

NICHOLAS M. HARING S.A.C.

THE object of this study is to probe more deeply into the use of the Greek Fathers by Gilbert of Poitiers and his school and into the influence of these Fathers on their trinitarian theology. The existence of such an influence has occasionally been stated with the conclusion that a Greek approach to the mystery of the Trinity led Gilbert to tritheism and "in a certain sense" to polytheism. After referring to the heresies of Sabellius and Arius, the well-known historian of Canon Law, Paul Fournier,<sup>1</sup> wrote in 1886: "Gilbert who was considered one of the most learned men of his century had only avoided these errors to drift into another peril: exaggerating the idea of trinity at the expense of the idea of unity, he was led to teach a system which has, with good reason, been accused of being tritheistic if not in a certain sense polytheistic."

Fournier's contemporary, Th. de Regnon,<sup>2</sup> on the other hand, does not refer to any Greek influences on Gilbert; yet he strongly insists that Gilbert taught "la distinction réelle... entre Dieu et la divinité."<sup>3</sup> Gilbert's biographer, A. Berthaud, is less concerned about this particular question and blames Gilbert's embarrassments on "la secte des Porréains."<sup>4</sup> Moreover, he makes the strange proposition that Gilbert had nothing in common with the conduct of his school: "Gilbert demeura complètement étranger à la conduite des Porrétains."<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> 'Un adversaire inconnu de saint Bernard et de Pierre Lombard', *Bibl. de l'Ecole des Chartes* 47 (1886) 394-5, reprinted in *Etudes sur Joachim de Flore* (Paris, 1909) 51: "Gilbert, qui passait pour un des hommes les plus cultivés de son siècle, n'avait évité ces erreurs que pour tomber sur un autre écueil: exagérant l'idée de trinité aux dépens de l'idée d'unité, il fut amené à enseigner un système que l'on accusa à bon droit d'être trithéiste sinon en un certain sens polythéiste." Fournier's thesis that Joachim was influenced by Gilbert has been repeatedly questioned. M. W. Bloomfield, 'Joachim of Flora', *Traditio* 13 (1957) 273 states bluntly: "To me it seems unlikely that a man of Joachim's stripe would have been able to understand him, let alone follow and support him."

<sup>2</sup> *Etudes de théologie positive sur la Sainte Trinité* (Paris, 1892) 87-109.

<sup>3</sup> Th. de Regnon, p. 108. F. Courtney, *Cardinal Robert Pullen* (Rome, 1954) 138, goes so far as to declare that both Gilbert of Poitiers and Gilbert the Universal had "motives which compelled them to draw a real distinction between the divine essence and the divine Persons."

<sup>4</sup> A. Berthaud, *Gilbert de la Porrée, Evêque de Poitiers et sa philosophie* (Poitiers, 1892) 304.

<sup>5</sup> A. Berthaud, p. 304.

Fournier's verdict found followers. Speaking of the *Liber de vera philosophia*, discovered by Fournier, C. Ottaviano<sup>6</sup> declares: "L'opera risale indubbiamente alla scuola triteistica di Gilberto della Porrée." He denies, however, that the Greek Fathers are responsible for Gilbert's tritheistic doctrine.<sup>7</sup> Another historian refers with the same conviction to "the thesis of the tritheist Gilbert."<sup>8</sup>

These charges of tritheism or even polytheism of a sort are relatively new in the long and sad history of misrepresentations of Gilbert's doctrines. It is true that St. Bernard refused to accept Gilbert's "fourth divinity which is not God,"<sup>9</sup> and that his secretary, Geoffrey of Auxerre, accused Gilbert of teaching a quaternity in God.<sup>10</sup> But they do not charge him with tritheism,<sup>11</sup> that is to say, with the doctrine that there are three gods. However, the effort to shift the blame from Gilbert to his school is not at all new, for even St. Bernard distinguishes between Gilbert who "humbly acquiesced" and those who still copied and read his works after the Consistory of Reims (1148), men who "all too contentiously insisted on following the Bishop to the very position in which he stood and who would rather have him as their teacher of error than of correction."<sup>12</sup>

It is likewise true that the Greek Fathers were linked with Gilbert's teaching at an early stage of the conflict. Geoffrey of Auxerre tells us that on the first day of the Consistory at Reims: "that man from Poitiers had his clerics carry in *magnorum voluminum corpora*, while we had only a few *auctoritates* of the Church on a single piece of parchment."<sup>13</sup> But

<sup>6</sup> C. Ottaviano, *Joachim Abbatis Liber contra Lombardum* (Rome, 1934) 45.

<sup>7</sup> Ottaviano, p. 53.

<sup>8</sup> Fr. Foberti, *Gioacchino de Fiore e il Gioacchinismo antico e moderno* (Padua, 1942) 70: "la tesi del triteista Gilberto."

<sup>9</sup> *De Cons.* V, 7, 15; PL 182, 797B.

<sup>10</sup> *Libellus contra capitula Gilberti*, 40; PL 185, 609A.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. *De Cons.* V, 7, 16; PL 185, 797C: *Asseritis ergo, etsi non multiplacem, duplicem Deum.*

<sup>12</sup> *Serm. in Cant.* 80, 9; PL 183, 1170D: *Sed haec minime jam contra ipsum loquimur, quippe qui in eodem conventu sententiae episcoporum humiliter acquiescens tam haec quam cetera digna reprehensione proprio ore damnavit sed propter eos qui adhuc librum illum, contra apostolicum utique promulgatum ibidem interdictum transcribere et lectitare feruntur, contentiosius persistentes sequi episcopum in quo ipse quo stetit et erroris quam correctionis magistrum habere malentes.*

<sup>13</sup> *Ep. ad Albinum*, 4; PL 185, 589C. Against the *Hist. litt.* 14, 339, and others, R. L. Poole, *Hist. Pontif.* (Oxford, 1927) XXXIX, n. 1, has shown that the addressee was not Henry, Cardinal Bishop of Albano (1179-89), but Albinus whom a charter issued by Tancred on July 7, 1191, calls Papal Vicar. This is confirmed by an unpublished tract written by Master Michael, found in MS Troyes, 1721, 2°: *Reverendo Patri et Domino Albino, Albani episcopo, Domini Papae vicario...* Cf. *Cat. Gén.* 4°, 2 (1855) 727.

"on the following day," as Geoffrey proudly relates, "we brought in so many *codices* that the Bishop's patrons were struck with amazement."<sup>14</sup>

We learn from Geoffrey that, on the first day, Gilbert was silenced with the "rather evident *auctoritas* of St. Athanasius"<sup>15</sup> which was in reality a text from Vigilius<sup>16</sup> of Thapsus (fl. 484) whose works were widely circulated under the name of Athanasius. From another source we gather that a second Greek author, Theodoret, was twice cited against Gilbert.<sup>17</sup> We shall see that, in addition to St. Hilary, Theodoret was Gilbert's principal patristic authority on the question whether there is some distinction between nature and person in God.

It is difficult to determine whether these two "Greek" authorities or at least Theodoret were consulted and quoted as a result of Gilbert's appeal to Greek Fathers or whether they were already found among "the few *auctoritates* of the Church" listed against Gilbert on the *schedula* brought in on the first day.<sup>18</sup> Even if the *schedula* did already contain them, it may have been the result of the previous trial at Paris in 1147.

Both "Athanasius" and Theodoret became part of the collection of texts cited against Gilbert. Thus we find two texts from "our theologian" Athanasius in Geoffrey's *Libellus contra capitula Gilberti*, written after Gilbert's death (1154).<sup>19</sup> The next text in the *Libellus* is anonymous and corrupted.<sup>20</sup> It dates back to Theodoret and should read: *Existentis scientia est Deus, Deus est Trinitas*,<sup>21</sup> for in this form it agrees literally with the other source quoted above.<sup>22</sup> The following text in the

<sup>14</sup> *Ep. ad Albinum*, 6; PL 185, 590D.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibidem*: Cui evidens satis opposita est auctoritas Athanasii in haec verba: Supernarum virtutum carmina unum tria et tria unum esse confirmat.

<sup>16</sup> Vigilius, *Contra Ar.* II, 42; PL 62, 225A. Cf. *Libellus contra capitula*, 36; PL 185, 608B.

<sup>17</sup> J. Leclercq, 'Textes sur Saint Bernard et Gilbert de la Porrée', *MSt* 14 (1952) 108 (MS Vat. Reg. lat. 278, fols. 72-3). The first text is attributed to Theodoricus, Gregorius (perhaps a distortion of Theodoretus Graecus) and reads: *Ibi enim unitas vere est trinitas et trinitas vere est unitas*. It is found in PG 83, 1171B and in the *Collectio Sangermanensis*: ed. E. Schwartz, ACO II, 2, 153 (line 23): *Ibi enim vere est unitas trinitas et trinitas vere est unitas*. The second text, attributed to Theodericus, reads: *Existentis scientia est Deus, Deus est trinitas*. It is found in PG 83, 1167A and ACO II, 5, 150: *Existentis vero scientia est Deus, Deus autem est trinitas*.

<sup>18</sup> *Ep. ad Alb.*, 4; PL 185, 589C.

<sup>19</sup> *Libellus*, 38; PL 185, 608BC: Vigilius, *Contra Ar.* II, 42 and 46; PL 62, 225A (*Illuc mihi... perdoceam*) and 227D-228A (*Nec Sabellium... ingenue confitemur*).

<sup>20</sup> *Libellus*, 39; PL 185, 608C: *Ex istis scientia est Deus, Deus est Trinitas*.

<sup>21</sup> PG 83, 1167A or ACO II, 5, 150: *Existentis vero scientia est Deus, Deus autem est Trinitas*. Against all his MSS, E. Schwartz reads *Dei* instead of the first *Deus*, a correction wrongly suggested by Cotelier.

<sup>22</sup> See note 17, *supra*.



*Libellus* reads: Idem: Ibi enim unitas... est unitas.<sup>23</sup> It also dates back to Theodoret and agrees literally with the other source already quoted.<sup>24</sup> Less surprising than the quotations from Theodoret is Geoffrey's text from Gregory Nazianzen, *De Luminibus*, for it had been translated centuries before by Rufinus.<sup>25</sup>

Let us now return to the Consistory of Reims. On the second day of the trial, the Greeks met with less favour when Gilbert called on them in support of his own views. According to Geoffrey, Gilbert made his clerics read passages from the books of St. Hilary and from "the letters of some Greeks" found in a *corpus canonum*.<sup>26</sup> Geoffrey, however, tells us that they were all "less intelligible", not only because of the hurry in which they were read, but also on account of such a large and mixed audience to which they were read.<sup>27</sup>

The fact that St. Hilary was quoted should not come as a surprise, for Gilbert was an acknowledged authority on "the Athanasius of the West,"<sup>28</sup> as St. Bernard himself admitted when, some time after the Consistory, he asked Gilbert to pick the religious house in which they might meet to discuss some obscure texts in St. Hilary. Gilbert declined, not quite politely.<sup>29</sup>

Philip of Harvengt, first Prior (1130-58), then abbot of Bonne-Espérance (1158-82), has recorded an interesting illustration of Gilbert's familiarity with Hilary. Philip had been asked by a friend, called John, for a work attributed to St. Athanasius. In returning it rather abruptly, John pointed out that its attribution to Athanasius was wrong

<sup>23</sup> *Libellus*, 39; PL 185, 608C

<sup>24</sup> PG 83, 1171B or ACO II, 5, 153. See note 17 above.

<sup>25</sup> *Libellus*, 51; PL 185, 613B: Gregorius Nazianzenus: Deus cum... provocet intellectum. *De Luminibus*, 11; CSEL 46, 121.

<sup>26</sup> J. de Ghellinck, 'Patristique et argument de tradition au bas moyen âge', *Beiträge*, Suppl. 3, 1 (1935) 414, speaks of: les nombreux textes, dont pas mal de grecs, accumulés par Gilbert de la Porrée au grand étonnement de ses contemporains.

<sup>27</sup> *Ep. ad Alb.*, 6; PL 185, 591A: Faciebat episcopus in libris beati Hilarii et, de corpore canonum, in quorundam Graecorum epistolis verba minus intelligibilia — praesertim in tanta festinatione et in tanta ac tali multitudine — lectitari. John of Salisbury, *Hist. Pont.*, 10; ed. Poole, p. 24, speaks of a *multitudo laicorum* present at the Consistory. Since they could not understand all that went on at the trial, Pope Eugene spoke to them in French when he realized that they misinterpreted the tearing-up of a certain book which they thought to be Gilbert's.

<sup>28</sup> See the *De commendatione magistri Gisleberti*; ed. J. Leclercq, *Arch. d'hist. doctr. et litt. du moyen âge* 19 (1952) 184.

<sup>29</sup> John of Salisbury, *Hist. Pont.*, 11; ed. Poole, p. 27. Peter Lombard, *Sent.* III, 15, 3; ed. Quaracchi (1916) 617-620, deals at length with "some obscure chapters" in St. Hilary.

since it contained many false statements concerning Christ.<sup>30</sup> Philip admits that he, too, had come across difficult passages but had been inclined to consider them obscure rather than contrary to the faith, especially in view of St. Athanasius' high reputation for orthodoxy.<sup>31</sup> He concludes his long explanation of some texts with the customary *Valete*. The letter then continues: "Finally, after writing this letter and adding the *Valete* with which letters are usually concluded, I learned from Master Gislebert, Bishop of Poitiers,<sup>32</sup> that the book we have been discussing was written not by Athanasius, as our title says, but by Hilary of Poitiers whose faith and doctrine is found to be commendable. For the day before yesterday when I was in Paris and the said Master and Bishop Gislebert deigned to speak to me, he introduced during the conversation a short sentence with the words: 'Thus', he said, 'says Hilary in his *De Trinitate*'. I recognized the sentence quite well and asked him whether Hilary was truly the author of the work from which the sentence was taken, since the title of our *codex* bore the name of Athanasius. Lest the erroneous title should make me doubtful, he cited from memory the beginning of the whole work, adding how many books it contained and in which of them the sentence he had used was found. When I realized that all this fully applied to this work, I asked, in addition, whether the entire work was to be considered worthy of trust. And he replied: 'Whatever is contained in it, is worthy of commendation'. Thus through him my error concerning the author of this work has been removed and my view concerning the truth of that dogma confirmed."<sup>33</sup>

Who then were the Greeks whose letters were found in a *corpus canonum*? It should be remembered that Geoffrey makes his statement about "the Greeks" in a letter written "almost forty years"<sup>34</sup> after his *Libellus*, in other words, a few years<sup>35</sup> before 1194, at the order<sup>36</sup> of

<sup>30</sup> *Ep.* 22; PL 203, 170AD. Cf. *Ep.* 5; PL 203, 35B.

<sup>31</sup> *Ep.* 5; PL 203, 35BD.

<sup>32</sup> Since Gilbert was bishop of Poitiers from 1142-54, the incident must have occurred when Philip was still Prior of Bonne-Espérance.

<sup>33</sup> *Ep.* 5; PL 203, 45C-46A.

<sup>34</sup> *Ep. ad Albinum*, 13; PL 185, 595A.

<sup>35</sup> According to John of Salisbury, *Hist. Pont.*, 11; ed. Poole, p. 26, Geoffrey wrote his *Libellus* after Gilbert's death (late in 1154). If we take "almost forty years" to mean 37-38 years and allow some months to elapse after Gilbert's death in September or November, 1154, we arrive at 1192-93.

<sup>36</sup> *Ep. ad Alb.*, 1; PL 185, 587B: Injunxerat vestra paternitas venerabili fratri nostro et vestro speciali filio, Augustino, ut de mandato vestro mihi imponeret vobis per epistolam diligenter notum facere qualiter in Remensi concilio... super quibusdam capitulis in *Expositione* Pictaviensis episcopi, magistri Gilberti, cognomento Porretani, deprehensis et reprehensis tractatum, quid et quemadmodum tandem fuerit iudicatum.

Albinus, "Bishop of Albano and Papal Vicar", who had demanded a report on both Gilbert and Abelard.<sup>37</sup> The available sources clearly point to two originally Greek works used by Gilbert.

One of them is a long letter by St. Sophronius, Patriarch of Jerusalem (634-8), to Sergius, Patriarch of Constantinople (d. 638). This letter is indeed contained in a *corpus canonum*, viz., in the Latin Acts of the sixth General Council (680).<sup>38</sup> In Gilbert's time, there existed two Latin versions of these Acts one of which dates back to the reign of Pope Sergius I (687-701).<sup>39</sup> The date of the second version is unknown.<sup>40</sup> The quotations from this letter found in the works of Hugh of Honau<sup>41</sup> and Adhemar of St. Ruf<sup>42</sup> prove that Gilbert and his school used the first

<sup>37</sup> *Ep. ad Alb.*, 14; PL 185, 595B. It should be noted that Albinus was a Canon Regular who received the cardinal's hat from Pope Lucius III (1181-85). He signed papal documents first as Cardinal-Deacon of S. Maria Nuova (Aug., 1182-March, 1185), then as Cardinal Priest of S. Croce in Gerusalemme (May, 1185-May, 1189). He was consecrated Bishop of Albano between May 18 and June 6, 1189. His signature is found under documents issued by Clement III (1187-91) and Celestine III (1191-98) until Juli 12, 1196. It is quite possible that Albinus acted so strongly at the request of Pope Celestine who, as Cardinal Hyacinth, was in France from 1162-65. At that time there was among his *clerici* a certain Everard of Ypres, a staunch disciple of Gilbert. Cf. N. Haring, 'The Cistercian Everard of Ypres and his appraisal of the conflict between St. Bernard and Gilbert of Poitiers', *MSt* 17 (1955) 143.

<sup>38</sup> F. Maassen, *Gesch. der Quellen und lit. des canonischen Rechts* (Graz, 1870) 760. To the best of my knowledge, Hincmar of Rheims (d. 882), is the first Latin theologian to use this letter: *De una et non trina deitate*, 1, 2, 6, 8, 12; PL 123, 491A, 511C, 536D, 547B, 567A. The source given by Hincmar is *sexta synodus*.

<sup>39</sup> Mansi 11, 207-738: reprint of J. Hardouin, *Conc. coll.* 3, 1043 ff. The letter is found in Mansi 11, 461-510, reprinted in PG 87 (III), 3174-3200.

<sup>40</sup> Mansi 11, 737-922: Hardouin 3, 1479 ff. This translation is described by Hardouin as: versio altera longe accuratior ex vetusto codice manuscripto Bibliothecae Collegii Parisiensis Societatis Jesu. The second version of the *Epistola synodica* of Sophronius is found in Mansi 11, 831-853. A comparison shows that Gilbert's school, and presumably Gilbert himself, used the first version. One example will suffice. Hugh of Honau quotes in his *Liber de homousion*, MS Cambridge, *Univers. Lib.* II.4.27, fol. 15: De eodem beatus Sophronius: Haec quidem Trinitas indivisibilem habet divisionem et inconfusam gerit coniunctionem. Cum dividitur namque numeralibus subsistentiis et numeratur personalibus alternitatibus, identitate essentiae atque naturae coniungitur. This agrees verbatim with the translation in Mansi 11, 466DE. Hugh inserted only the word *Trinitas* for obvious reasons. The second version of this text reads (Mansi 11, 833C): Ea quidem individuum habet divisionem et fert, quae confundi non potest, conjunctionem. nam numerabilibus divisa hypostatibus et personalibus numerata diversitatibus unita est in eo quod sit eadem essentia et natura. Hincmar of Reims (d. 882) also used the first version. See this text in PL 125, 491B.

<sup>41</sup> In his *Liber de homousion* Hugh quotes the letter twelve times; in his *Liber de diversitate* eight times.

<sup>42</sup> He quotes Sophronius four times in his *Tractatus de Trinitate*, MS Vat. Lat. 561, fols. 171-282.

version. Although the Acts of the sixth General Council contain other excerpts from Greek Fathers, our sources do not show that they were used. But Geoffrey was obviously right when he remembered a *corpus canonum* and was perhaps less accurate when he spoke of letters rather than a letter.

The second Greek author used by Gilbert and, as we have already seen, by his opponents was Theodoret of Cyrrhus (ab. 393-458?) or at least a Latin version of a treatise on the Trinity attributed to Theodoret. Like the letter of Sophronius this tract is also part of a conciliar collection, the so-called *Collectio Sangermanensis* of the Council of Chalcedon.<sup>43</sup> Since both collections are not particularly small, we can easily understand why Geoffrey speaks of *magnorum voluminum corpora*.

To prove that Gilbert made use of Theodoret's tract there are several witnesses. In his description of the proceedings at the Consistory of Reims (1148) Otto of Freising<sup>44</sup> points out that according to Gilbert some sort of theological distinction must be upheld between nature and person in God. Speaking of Gilbert, Otto writes: "He, however, endeavoured to prove with the help of both reason and authority that the intellect somehow distinguishes between nature and person, not (merely) by way of mathematical abstraction but on the grounds of theological consideration — with the help of reason, lest a man of the Catholic Faith would have to admit with Arius a plurality of essences as much as a plurality of Persons or would be compelled to reduce with Sabellius the plurality of Persons to the oneness of (God's) essence — with the help of authority, by using a text from Theodoret, *Against Sabellius*,<sup>45</sup> which

<sup>43</sup> Edited by E. Schwartz in ACO II, 5 (Berlin 1936) 3-155. Our treatise is found close to the end of the collection: Incipit beati Theodoriti De Trinitate (p. 150, line 14), followed by: *Contra Sabellium* eiusdem beati Theodoriti (p. 150, line 30). Its explicit reads: Explicit beati Theodoriti de Trinitate (p. 154, lines 12-13). The collection is found in MS Paris, B.N. lat. 12098, formerly Saint-Germain-des-Prés 466, from Corbie, s. X, and in MS Vienna, Nat. 397, a *gemellus*, s. X. The part of the collection containing Theodoret's tract is also preserved in MS Vat. lat. 1340, s. XIII, and Paris, B. N. lat. 2244, s. XII.

<sup>44</sup> *Gesta Frid.* I, 56; MGH SS 20, 383 (lines 7-15): Quod autem inter naturam et personam non mathematica abstractione sed theologica consideratione quoquo modo divideret ratio, et ratione et auctoritate probare nitebatur. Ratione, ne videlicet juxta Arium sicut personarum ita et pluralitatem admitteret essentiarum, vel secundum Sabellium ad essentiae singularitatem christianae fidei religio pluralitatem restringeret personarum, hac Theodereti, *Contra Sabellium* utens auctoritate: Oportet igitur desiderantem spirituales divitias et volentem christianorum dogmata vendicare, rerum non ignorare proprietatem, ne forte aliud pro aliis intelligens circa dogmata peccet. Qui enim naturam et personam idem esse intelligit, aut in divisionem Aarii incidit aut in confusionem Sabelli.

<sup>45</sup> ACO II, 5, 152 (lines 26-30) or PG 83, 1170AB.

reads: Whoever desires spiritual riches and whoever wishes to vindicate the Christian truths must not be ignorant of the proper constitution of things lest he sin against those truths by confusing one thing with another. For he who holds that nature and person are the same plunges either into the distinction (of essences) taught by Arius or into the fusion (of persons) taught by Sabellius."

Theodoret's rather short treatise <sup>46</sup> was also used copiously by two Porretans, Hugh of Honau<sup>47</sup> and Adhemar of St. Ruf.<sup>48</sup> That Gilbert studied both Sophronius and Theodoret thoroughly is confirmed by Hugh of Honau who, in 1180, showed the Papal legate, Peter of Pavia, the "treasure of books" he had just received in Constantinople from his friend Hugh Etherian. Describing the effect on the Papal legate, Hugh writes: "When he... had carefully read their most holy sayings<sup>49</sup> he was obviously amazed at such great wisdom in Gisilbert, Bishop of Poitiers, seeing that both his written and spoken words were completely steeped in Greek ways of thinking although, being ignorant of their language, he had never read the volumes written by the Greeks. He immediately ordered a transcription of those books. It escaped him, however, that Gisilbert had often perused the Latin versions of the writings of Theodoret and Sophronius, in addition to books written by others, both Greeks and Latins, most of all Athanasius and Hilary, of whose support he availed himself with glory at the Council of Reims in the presence of Pope Eugene against the retorts of his rivals."<sup>50</sup>

<sup>46</sup> It was first published by Etienne Baluze, *Miscell.* IV, 1-8, reprinted in Andrea Gallandi, *Biblioth.* IX, 416, and in PG 83, 1167-1172. It was also edited and emended by J. B. Cotelier, *Eccle. Graecae Monum* III, 560. Baluze collated a manuscript preserved at Beauvais but no longer extant.

<sup>47</sup> He quotes Theodoret once in the *Liber de diversitate* (fol. 177) and six times in his *Liber de homousion*. Part of the text quoted by Otto is found on fol. 54<sup>r</sup>: *Dixit beatus Theodorus: Qui enim naturam... in confusionem Sabellii*. Joachim of Flora, *Liber contra Lombardum*; ed. Carmelo Ottaviano (Rome 1934) 147, quotes Theodoret as follows: *Item idem Athanasius ad Theodericum contra Sabellium: Arguitur insensatus Sabelius qui sensu iudaico asserit monarchiam et nomina tantum sine subsistentiis tria*. The text (abbreviated) is found in ACO II, 5, 150, line 30.

<sup>48</sup> He quotes it four times under the title: *Contra Sabellium*. Otto's excerpt is found on fol. 265<sup>v</sup> and agrees with Adhemar's text to the letter.

<sup>49</sup> He means the Greek Fathers.

<sup>50</sup> Ch. H. Haskins, *Studies in the Hist. of Mediaeval Science* (Cambridge, Mass., 1924) 211: *Cum... sanctissimas illorum sententias diligenter ruminasset, admiratus plane fuit tantam in Gisilberto Pictaviensi episcopo sapientiam quod, cum Graecorum volumina tamquam linguae eorum ignarus nunquam legisset, in illorum tamen intellectu totus fuisset. Statimque illos transcribi iussit. Latebat tamen eum quod beati Theoderiti et Sophronii scripta in latinum translata saepe revolvisset cum aliorum libris sive Graecorum sive Latinorum et maxime Athanasii et Hilarii quorum suffragiis in concilio Remensi coram Papa Eugenio contra*

Did the direct contact with Greek theology, especially with the two writings by Sophronius and Theodoret influence Gilbert's trinitarian Theology? It is safe to say that particularly Theodoret confirmed and strengthened him in what he considered a basic trinitarian statement, namely that more than a "mathematical" or purely mental distinction must be upheld between nature and person in God.<sup>51</sup> A denial of any distinction whatever leads straight either to Sabellianism by identifying the divine nature with each person, or to Arianism by multiplying divine nature with each person.<sup>52</sup> The divine nature is, as it were, the principle of divine unity. That which constitutes the three persons is the principle of multiplicity or plurality, but not of unity. In other words, that which makes Father, Son, and Holy Spirit to be *one* God must not be absolutely identified with that which constitutes them as *three* persons. However, this distinction must be maintained without detriment to the absolute simplicity of the divine essence or *usia*.

This contention soon led to lively debates at the Consistory in Reims. As Otto relates, a great commotion followed when Gilbert declared: Audacter confiteor alio esse Patrem, alio Deum, nec tamen esse hoc et hoc.<sup>53</sup> The proof that Gilbert was no tritheist lies in the remark: *nec*

suorum emulorum oblocutiones usus fuit cum gloria. Concerning Peter of Pavia see H. Delehay, 'Pierre de Pavie légat du pape Alexandre III en France', *Rev. des questions hist.* 49 (1891) 30-40.

<sup>51</sup> There was no perfect agreement on this point among Gilbert's followers. In fact, Otto of Freising, *Gesta Frid.* I, 57; MGH SS 20, 384, leans towards the view that it was only a difference in speech: Unde adhuc a probatoribus eiusdem episcopi auditoribus tenetur, ne ratio ibi discernat in intelligendo sed tantum in dicendo. If this were true, Gilbert would have said so and his opponents, to be sure, would have been more than satisfied. The author of the *Sent. divinitatis* IV, 5; ed. B. Geyer, *Beiträge* 7 (1908) 68\*, writes with regard to the distinction between God and divinity (which is, of course, a different problem): Nonne divinitas est Deus et non aliud a Deo? Respondeo quod divinitas est Deus et non aliud a Deo actu rationis sed non forma loquendi, ratione fidei, non ratione humanae philosophiae.

<sup>52</sup> The earliest statement of this doctrine occurs in Gilbert's comment on *Eph.* 4:10: *Qui descendit* etc. Hic dicendum quod inter personam et eius substantiam ratio dividit et quod saepe multarum substantiarum est una persona. Substantia cuiusque dicitur forma substantiae eius ut divinitas Dei Patris et Filii et Spiritus sancti, et sua cuiuslibet corporalitas corporis... The text, transcribed from MS Paris, B. N. lat. 2581, fol. 91<sup>v</sup>, is quoted by V. Miano, 'Il commento alle lettere di S. Paolo di Gilberto Porretano', *Scholastica ratione... instauranda* (Rome, 1951) 191. The commentary was written before 1141, the year in which it was first censured by Gerhoch of Reichersberg. See P. Classen, *Gerhoch von Reichersberg* (Wiesbaden, 1960) 94.

<sup>53</sup> *Gesta Frid.* I, 52; MGH SS 20, 379, lines 43-43. See Augustine, *De Trin.* VII, 4, 9; PL 42, 942; Aliud Deo esse, aliud Patrem esse. Cf. N. Haring, 'The Case of Gilbert de la Porrée', *MSt* 13 (1951) 16-17. Gilbert's terminology (*hoc et hoc*) is derived from Boethius, *De Trin.* 2; ed. Rand-Stewart, p. 10, lines 37-39.

*tamen esse hoc et hoc*, a remark made precisely to safeguard one aspect of the trinitarian mystery, the absolute simplicity and oneness of the divine essence. Had Gilbert spoken a few centuries later, he would have said: *nec tamen esse rem et rem*, or *nec tamen esse distinctionem realem*. Gilbert's *hoc et hoc* may be an ablative or an accusative. In both cases he meant to deny a numerical distinction between God and the Father or between that which makes the Father to be Father and that which makes the Father to be God, for such a numerical distinction would have justified the accusation that he advocated a quaternity.

It is worth noting that since the days of Gilbert's trial, Latin theologians have been divided in their answer to this problem. St. Bernard's refusal to consider such a distinction and Lombard's denunciation of this "heresy" became the standard replies of one faction, whereas the *distinctio formalis ex natura rei*, proposed by Duns Scotus, turned out to be the saving formula of those who accepted the cogency of Gilbert's arguments without detriment to God's absolute simplicity. The claim, made by some authors,<sup>54</sup> that the Scotist view was "implicitly disapproved of" at Reims may sound anachronistic but, though in basic agreement with Scotus on this point, Gilbert demanded less in the sense that some distinction should be admitted only between nature and person, while Scotus applied his distinction to certain divine attributes.

In addition to Theodoret, Gilbert cited St. Hilary who distinguishes between *natura* or abstract form and *res naturae* or concrete thing or person. Hilary finally declares: *Et secundum hoc non idem est Deus et quod Dei est*.<sup>55</sup> That this text from Hilary was indeed used as recorded by Otto of Freising, may be confirmed by Peter Lombard's animated, if not immoderate, attack on those who went so insane as to quote it to prove that, in God, "nature and person are not the same." On the strength of Hilary's statement, those "heretics", as Lombard calls them, "dogmatized" that God's nature is not the three persons.<sup>56</sup> They hold that a distinction must be made between *natura* and *res naturae*, that is between nature and person.<sup>57</sup> Lombard makes no mention of Theodoret, although he attended the Consistory of Reims.

<sup>54</sup> Cf. A. Hayen, 'Le concile de Reims et l'erreur théologique de Gilbert de la Porrée' *Arch. d'hist. doct. et litt. du moyen âge*, 10-11 (1935-6) 89.

<sup>55</sup> *Gesta Frid.* I, 56; p. 383, lines 15-20; Hilary, *De Trinitate* VIII, 21; PL 10, 252C.

<sup>56</sup> *Sent.* I, 34, 1; ed. Quaracchi (1916) 212: *Quidam perversi sensus homines in tantam prosilierunt insaniam, ut dicerent non idem esse naturam Dei et personam sive hypostasim... Propter haec et hujusmodi inter naturam et personam dividunt... Idque testimonio Hilarii defendere nituntur qui...*

<sup>57</sup> *Sent.* I, 34, 1; p. 213: *Et ideo dicunt... distinguendum esse inter naturam et rem naturae i.e. personam.*

Gilbert and his two *auctoritates*, Hilary and Theodoret, failed to convince Pope Eugene III. According to Otto, all charges against Gilbert were dropped with the exception of one: *De primo tantum Romanus Pontifex diffinivit ne aliqua ratio in theologia inter naturam et personam divideret*.<sup>58</sup> John of Salisbury who personally attended the Consistory points out that there were no official records to prove any papal decision for or against Gilbert.<sup>59</sup> But if Otto's report is accurate — and he knew the Papal curia well enough to learn the truth — Eugene pronounced also against Theodoret and Hilary or at least against the interpretation given to St. Hilary's words by Gilbert. Even at a consistory this was no trifling matter, but whereas the meaning of Hilary's testimony was at least controversial, the unambiguous statement made by Theodoret might have been impugned for a variety of reasons:

Was the treatise an authentic work? To the present date historians provide no definite answer.<sup>60</sup> Supposing the treatise was Theodoret's, who was Theodoret? At least some mediaeval scribes must have thought the name was Theodoric<sup>61</sup> or a false attribution.<sup>62</sup> Hugh of Honau<sup>63</sup> and Adhemar of St. Ruf<sup>64</sup> call him "Blessed Theodoret." They relied on the accuracy of their source.<sup>65</sup> If any one at Reims knew who Theodoret was, he might have denounced him as an enemy of St. Cyril and the Council of Ephesus; he might have disclosed that a number of Theodoret's writings were condemned by a General Council in 553. Had there been any suspicion at all, Gilbert's opponents would certainly have drawn attention to it. They would have refrained from quoting Theodoret. But, as we have seen, they too quoted him.

<sup>58</sup> *Gesta Frid.* I, 57; p. 384, lines 32-33.

<sup>59</sup> *Hist. Pontif.*, II; ed. Poole, p. 26.

<sup>60</sup> E. Schwartz, ACO II, 5, 150-154, notes some parallels with Theodoret's authentic writings which favour its authenticity.

<sup>61</sup> The text published by J. Leclercq, 'Textes sur Saint Bernard', MSt 14 (1952) 108, reads *Theodericus Gregorius* in introducing the first quotation, *Theodericus* in introducing the second. *Gregorius* may be a scribe's error for *Graecus*. At least one MS of Otto's *Gesta Friderici* reads *Theodorici*, two read *Theodoriti*, the other three *Theoderiti*. Choosing the one truly wrong variant, M. E. Williams, *The Teaching of Gilbert Porreta on the Trinity* (Rome, 1951) 120, writes: As his authority Gilbert quotes Theodoricus (Thierry of Chartres?) who says...

<sup>62</sup> The fact that in one instance just quoted the reading is Theodoricus Gregorius and the fact that the name is simply omitted in Geoffrey's *Libellus* (PL 185, 608C) would seem to substantiate this view.

<sup>63</sup> *Liber de homousion*; MS Cambridge, Univ. Lib. II.4.27, fols 15 (twice), 16<sup>v</sup>, 54<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>64</sup> *Tractatus de Trinitate*; MS Vat. Lat. 561, fols. 186<sup>ra</sup>, 194<sup>v</sup>, 248.

<sup>65</sup> See note 43 above.



It would be erroneous to believe that the Consistory changed Gilbert's mind. The preface he added to his commentary on Boethius after his trial is in part a bitter denunciation of those "who have learned nothing, yet in their opinion know everything, men who are philosophers devoid of reason, prophets without vision, teachers of things impossible, judges of things unknown."<sup>66</sup> He charges the "new heretics" with Sabellianism, Donatism, and Pelagianism.<sup>67</sup> "What has been written by us," Gilbert finally declares, "is to well-trained readers not only solid in reasoning but also in such harmony with authentic writings that one may come to think it was stolen rather than invented."<sup>68</sup>

Gilbert's reactions were shared by his school, especially by its more active members. They were convinced that they did not stand alone and that they had "the fountain-head of all Latin learning," Greece, on their side. We need not discuss here the Greek learning displayed by Everard of Ypres who claims he taught Gilbert some Greek.<sup>69</sup> His knowledge of Greek Fathers is second-hand and very limited.<sup>70</sup> We must turn to those admirers who left no stone unturned to show that Gilbert had not deviated from orthodoxy.

<sup>66</sup> *Expos. in Boethii lib. de Trinitate*, praef., 4; ed. N. M. Haring, in R. O'Donnell, 'Nine Mediaeval Thinkers', *Studies and Texts* 1 (Toronto, 1955) 33.

<sup>67</sup> *Ibid.*, 5-6; pp. 33-34.

<sup>68</sup> *Ibid.*, 7; p. 34.

<sup>69</sup> N. M. Haring, 'A Latin Dialogue on the Doctrine of Gilbert of Poitiers', *MSt* 15 (1953) 252. Judgements about Gilbert's school vary. We have seen that A. Berthaud speaks of "la secte des Porrétains." J. de Ghellinck, *Le mouvement théologique du XII<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Bruges, 1948) 179, describes it as a "groupe compact, intelligent et décidé, à terminologie axiomatique conquérant" and (p. 176) "un groupe ténace de partisans combattifs, en France et ailleurs." A. Dondaine 'Hugues Ethérien et Léon Toscan', *Arch. d'hist. doctr. et litt.* 19 (1952) 68, calls it "la petite école." As to the number of its members, Dondaine (p. 90) declares: "nous sommes persuadés que le nombre des Porrétains intégristes fut des plus limité: il s'agit bien d'un petit cercle fermé." H. Fichtenau, 'Magister Petrus von Wien', *Mitteil. des Inst. f. Oesterr. Gesch.* 63 (1955) 292, comments on this view by quoting the chronicler Magnus of Reichersberg (MGH SS 17,496): Fuerunt enim et adhuc supersunt non pauci numero nec parvae aestimationis homines sed valde litterati... S. Gammersbach, 'Gilbert und seine Prozesse im Urteil der Zeitgenossen', *Neue Münst. Beiträge z. Geschichtsforschung* 5 (Cologne 1959) 121, distinguishes between radical and moderate Porretans. The former, he holds, exaggerated the image of their master.

<sup>70</sup> See also N. M. Haring, 'The Cistercian Everard of Ypres and his Appraisal of the Conflict between St. Bernard and Gilbert of Poitiers', *MSt* 17 (1955) 143-172. Everard exalts the Greek learning of "that greatest and keenest philosopher Gilbert" ('A Latin Dialogue', p. 251) who thoroughly penetrated "the minds of the loftiest both Greek and Latin philosophers, viz., Euclid, Aristotle, Plato, Boethius, and Cicero as well as the thought and faith of the orthodox Fathers both Greek and Latin, viz., Basil, Eusebius, Dionysius, Augustine, Hilary, and Gregory" (*Ibid.*, pp. 251 f).

The author of the *Liber de vera philosophia*, unfortunately a rather vicious critic of St. Bernard's, tells us that "a certain Master A(dhemar), Canon of St. Ruf (Valence),<sup>71</sup> a man advanced in years but more advanced in wisdom, religion and dignity, who from the time of the Council of Reims (1148) celebrated by Pope Eugene... until almost the time of the Roman Council (1179) celebrated by Pope Alexander never ceased to search most studiously and with all diligence through the infinite number of churches and monasteries of Gaul, Spain, Italy, and even Greece, questioning all learned men, reading and re-reading the innumerable volumes that were said to contain something on the Holy Trinity and its unity, that is to say whether the statement: *Quicquid est in Deo, Deus est* or some other statement from which it could be deduced was ever put down in writing by a saint. For it seemed to him that that axiom was the cause and origin of all the novelties through which the Sabellian heresy appeared without a doubt to be resuscitated."<sup>72</sup>

Canon Adhemar found no evidence of the statement in previous writers. As a result of his research he compiled a *Collectio*, divided into 24 distinctions, of texts pertaining to the Holy Trinity and its unity, to the Incarnation and the Eucharist.<sup>73</sup> He donated one copy of the *Collectio* to Pope Alexander who, we are told, received it very gratefully. Another copy he sent to the Canons Regular of Maguelonne.<sup>74</sup> A third copy went to the Benedictine abbey of Psalmodi near Nîmes. A fourth copy was sent to *Alemaniam* which probably means that it went to the Canons Regular of either Honau or Marbach in Alsace-Lorraine<sup>75</sup> Canon Adhemar gave a fifth copy to the church of St. Ruf in Valence "together with another treatise, *Concerning the Trinity*."<sup>76</sup> Finally, he presented a copy to the author of the *Liber de vera philosophia* who admits that he left it behind in Jerusalem.<sup>77</sup>

<sup>71</sup> *Archives de la France monastique* 36 (Paris, 1932) 117.

<sup>72</sup> P. Fournier, *Etudes sur Joachim de Flore* (Paris, 1909) 74-75. Concerning Canon Adhemar see F. Pelster, 'Die anonyme Verteidigungsschrift der Lehre Gilberts v. Poitiers im Cod. Vat. lat. 561 und ihr Verfasser Canonicus Adhemar von Saint-Ruf in Valence', *Studia Mediaevalia in hon. R. J. Martin* (Bruges, s.d.) 113-146. In 1158, Adhemar was *sacrista* of Saint-Ruf (*Gall. chr.* 6, 106 *instr.*). He seems to have died before 1184.

<sup>73</sup> P. Fournier, p. 75.

<sup>74</sup> At that time the bishop of the diocese of Maguelonne was John II (1158-90), a Canon Regular and possibly the recipient of this copy. Cf. *Gall. chr.* 6, 752.

<sup>75</sup> I expect to show in a separate paper that Hugh of Honau used material collected by Adhemar.

<sup>76</sup> F. Pelster has shown that the quasi-commentary on Boethius, *De Trinitate* in MS Vat. lat. 561, fols. 171-281<sup>v</sup>, must be this *Tractatus de Trinitate* of Adhemar.

<sup>77</sup> P. Fournier, *Etudes*; p. 75. MS Vat. lat. 561 may be the copy left in Jerusalem.

Adhemar's treatise *Concerning the Trinity* reveals that, ignorant of Greek, our Canon Regular relied on known translations of Greek authors and fell victim to a number of spurious titles. Given here in alphabetical order, he quotes Alcuin (under the name of Augustine), Ambrose, Arnobius (under the name of Augustine), Boethius, Boniface, the councils of Toledo (XI) and Braga (I), Didymus (as translated by St. Jerome), Pseudo-Denis, Fulgentius, Gennadius (both under the name of St. Augustine), Gregory Nazianzen (as translated by Rufinus), Hilary (much more often than Augustine), Pope Hormisdas, Jerome, Isidore of Seville, Pope Leo I, Origen (in reality John Scotus Erigena), Porphyry, Priscian, Sophronius, Theodoret, Vigilius of Thapsus (under the names of Athanasius and Augustine). This list contains five genuinely Greek patristic authors. "Origen" and "Athanasius" were in reality Latin writers.

Adhemar's appraisal of the attacks on Gilbert's commentary on Boethius' *De Trinitate* reflects in tone Gilbert's angry verdict: "While in his exposition of things theological he used his own words based on the *auctoritates* of the saints, he did not intersperse it with the *auctoritates* themselves to confirm what he wrote by their testimony. Therefore some people who completely failed to grasp what he had written — logicians ignorant of the arts, philosophers without an idea of philosophy, Catholics without faith, wasting away with envy, presumptuous out of pride — poured the venom of destruction on the commentary he had written on this work, crying out with shrill voices that Master Gislebert had written against the faith. This was absolutely false as was shown when, at the Council of Reims, he manfully defended himself and his book with the *auctoritates* of the saints."<sup>78</sup> What better proof of Gilbert's orthodoxy could there be than the doctrine of the Fathers, as Adhemar explains in equally strong terms: "In order to expose more clearly the insanity and falsehood of such people, to make them understand the true teaching and the innocence of Master Gislebert, and to show that his work rests safely on the truth, we have reproduced, at the end of his work,<sup>79</sup> the full text of Boethius and have adapted the *auctoritates* of

<sup>78</sup> MS Vat. Lat. 561, fol. 175<sup>ra</sup>. F. Pelster, 'Die Verteidigungsschrift,' p. 145.

<sup>79</sup> This remark indicates that the first part of the manuscript which contains Gilbert's commentary on Boethius belongs to Adhemar's *Tractatus de Trinitate*. In consideration of the fact that the manuscript shows numerous pencilled references to Adhemar's *Collectio*, Pelster (p. 125) suggests that the author of the *Liber de vera philosophia* himself may have pencilled them. The Vatican manuscript was later owned by the Knights Templars in Paris and may have come into the Papal Library when, in 1312, the Order of the Knights Templars was suppressed by Clement V at the Council of Vienne. Pelster claims (p. 116)

Augustine, Jerome, Hilary, Ambrose, Athanasius, and other saints to the places in which Boethius treats of the Trinity or of the unity of the Trinity or of the nature of the three persons which nature — contrary to the Law and the Gospels that teach and preach it — some people refuse with horror to accept as being *in* the Trinity, or of the relations of the same (persons) so that if the careful reader — after perusing the words of the saints — returns to the words of Boethius and Master Gislebert in order to compare Boethius' handling of this question and Master Gislebert's exposition of the same question he will find that he taught exactly the same faith as is taught in the *auctoritates* of the saints."<sup>80</sup>

The relations between the Canons Regular and the White Monks were not always cordial in those days and one can hardly miss the hostile undertones of this defense. Less acrimonious but even more vigorous in the pursuit of vindicating Master Gilbert's orthodoxy was another Canon Regular, Hugh of Honau. His identity has been solidly established by A. Dondaine's discovery of a dossier of three letters and Hugh Etherian's *Liber de differentia naturae et personae*.<sup>81</sup> The three letters are addressed to Hugh Etherian in Constantinople: the first two by "the schoolman Hugh of Honau, Deacon of the Sacred Palace", that is the court of Frederick Barbarossa, the third by "the schoolman Peter of Vienna."

As the titles say, Hugh was a schoolman (*scholasticus*) and an official in the service of the Emperor Frederick Barbarossa (1152-90) when he wrote his two letters. While he was a Deacon of the Sacred Palace he was entrusted with several missions by Barbarossa. He tells us about two missions to Constantinople. For a variety of reasons the first is considered to have taken place in the early seventies. In the second half of the year 1170, the archchancellor Christian I, Archbishop of Mainz, went to Constantinople as an Imperial legate *pro magnis ecclesie Dei et imperii negotiis*.<sup>82</sup> He was to persuade Manuel I to withdraw his support

that the catalogues of Avignon do not confirm this. However, M. Faucon, *La Librairie des Papes d'Avignon* 2 (Paris, 1887) 136, records the following entry from the Catalogue de la Bibliothèque de Peniscola, no. 859: Item glose Guillelmi Porretani super libros de Trinitate et super librum de hebdomadibus et librum de duabus naturis in una persona Christi ipsius Boecii. At present, the Vatican Library has at least four copies of Gilbert's commentary on Boethius.

<sup>80</sup> MS Vat. lat. 561, fol. 175<sup>rb</sup>. Pelster, 'Die Verteidigungsschrift,' p. 146.

<sup>81</sup> 'Hugues Ethérien et Léon Toscan,' *AHDLM* 19 (1952) 67-134.

<sup>82</sup> Boehmer-Will, *Reg. Archiep. Magunt.* II, 28, no. 73. Christian I was archchancellor of the Imperial curia in Germany from Sep. 24, 1165 to June 25, 1183. During the same period the position of prothonotary was held by Master Henry (d. 1169-72), Wortwin (1172-1180),

of Pope Alexander III (1159-81).<sup>83</sup> In June of the following year a Greek delegation arrived in Cologne, and Frederick Barbarossa promised a second German delegation. Led by Conrad II, Bishop of Worms,<sup>84</sup> it actually set out for the East in 1172.

It has been suggested that Hugh of Honau accompanied the Greek delegation on its return to Constantinople (1171) in order to announce and prepare the way for the German delegation promised by Frederick. The suggestion is based on Hugh's silence concerning other delegates, for, without reference to others, he speaks of himself as *legatione Frederici gloriosissimi Romanorum Imperatoris functus ad Manuelem*...<sup>85</sup> By Hugh's own testimony the following facts are firmly established: he went to Constantinople on behalf of Frederick on two occasions, first during the schism (1159-1177). On that occasion he stayed in Constantinople "a month and seven days." The second time he went "in the year when, in spring, the Lateran Council (1179) was held." He stayed two months.<sup>86</sup> The question whether *legatio* signifies a group of delegates to which he belonged or a mission entrusted to Hugh alone is best left open, though Master Peter of Vienna makes a remark favouring the view that Hugh was more than just a member of a group.<sup>87</sup>

Hugh calls Gilbert his *praeceptor*<sup>88</sup> which I take to mean that he studied under Gilbert in France. Hence we may conjecture that during his student years he met Master Peter of Vienna<sup>89</sup> and Adhemar of St. Ruf.

and Ruodolf (1181-1188). The names of the Imperial notaries are also known. See H. Breslau, *Handb. der Urkundenlehre* (Leipzig, 1912) 507-510.

<sup>83</sup> W. Ohnsorge, 'Die Byzanzpolitik Friedrich Barbarossas,' *Deutsch. Arch.* 6 (1943) 120, reprinted in W. Ohnsorge, *Abendland und Byzanz* (Darmstadt, 1958) 456-491. Also reprinted is the appendix (pp. 489-91) in which the author tries to show that Abbot Nicholas of Siegburg is the *anonymus* whom, in 1952, A. Dondaine proved to be Hugh of Honau. The conjecture was understandable in 1943, but hardly in 1958.

<sup>84</sup> Arnold of Lübeck, *Chron. Slav.* I, 2; MGH SS 21, 116 ff.

<sup>85</sup> Haskins, *Studies*, p. 210. W. Ohnsorge, 'Die Byzanzpolitik,' p. 129.

<sup>86</sup> Haskins, *Studies*, p. 210.

<sup>87</sup> Peter's letter to Hugh Etherian; ed. Dondaine, 'Hugues', p. 132, lines 49-51: *Obsecro etiam discretionem vestram ut in magistro Hugone illam venerari curetis familiaritatem quam Dominus Imperator Romanorum piissimus Fridericus circa eius fidem et discretionem habet.*

<sup>88</sup> MS Cambridge, *Univ. Lib.* li.4.27, fol. 29: *teste praeceptore nostro Giselberto Pictaviensi episcopo.*

<sup>89</sup> Concerning Master Peter of Vienna consult H. Weisweiler, 'Das wiederaufg. Gutachten des Magister Petrus,' *Scholastik* 13 (1938) 225-246. H. Fichtenau, 'Ein französischer Früh-scholastiker in Wien,' *Jahrb. f. Landesk. v. Niederösterreich*, N. F. 29 (1944-8) 118-130. *Idem*, 'Mag. Petrus v. Wien,' *Mitteil. d. Inst. f. österr. Geschichtsf.* 63 (1955) 293-297. P. Classen, 'Das Konzil von Konstantinopel 1166 und die Lateiner', *Byz. Zeitschr.* 48 (1955) 339-369. A. Dondaine, 'Hugues Ethérien et Léon Toscan', *AHDLM A* 19 (1952) 67-134. *Idem*, 'Hugh Ethérien et le concile de Constantinople de 1166', *Hist. Jahrb.* 77 (1958) 473-483.

Everard of Ypres gives a vivid account of how fast news and gossip travelled in his days.<sup>90</sup> Hence it is quite likely that Hugh of Honau knew about Peter of Vienna's transfer to Austria (1153/4). He resolved to meet Master Peter on his way to Constantinople. The three letters mentioned above and Hugh of Honau's introduction to his *Liber de diversitate*<sup>91</sup> enable us to see to what length Peter and Hugh went to procure more Greek patristic evidence to show that Greek Fathers advocated a distinction between nature and person.

In all likelihood, the dossier of letters found together with Hugh Etherian's *Liber de differentia*<sup>92</sup> is not complete. It presupposes some lost or at least unknown letters. The sequence of events may be reconstructed as follows: Master Peter of Vienna, a former student and ardent disciple of Gilbert of Poitiers,<sup>93</sup> turned to Hugh Etherian in Constantinople to obtain accurate information on the doctrinal decrees issued by the synod of Constantinople<sup>94</sup> in 1166. They may have met in May of that year,<sup>95</sup> or Hugh Etherian's growing reputation as an excellent Greek patristic scholar must have caused Peter to approach the Pisan by letter. Hugh Etherian's answer was delayed<sup>96</sup> and finally reached Peter in 1167 or 1168.<sup>97</sup> On his way to Constantinople, some three or four years later, Hugh of Honau visited Peter in Austria and presumably learned from his friend about Hugh Etherian. The imperial legate mentions that Peter was the first to draw his attention to the able translator and patristic scholar at the Bosphorus.<sup>98</sup>

Hugh left Peter<sup>99</sup> armed with a letter to Hugh Etherian. It is still extant.<sup>1</sup> In it Peter calls Hugh of Honau "your friend and mine."<sup>2</sup>

<sup>90</sup> See the *Dialogus Ratii et Everardi*; ed. Haring, *MSt* 15 (1953) 247: Sed quovis adveniente vel abbate vel monacho conventiculum fit, circumsedetur a monachis, de visis et auditis in saeculo, de rumoribus vagis, de principibus terrarum, de praelatis ecclesiarum quaestio fit...

<sup>91</sup> Haskins, *Studies*, pp. 210-212. A complete edition of this work is about to appear in *AHDLMA* (1962). I am also preparing the publication of the first treatise.

<sup>92</sup> An edition is found in the present volume of *MSt* pp. 16-34.

<sup>93</sup> A. Dondaine, 'Hugues Ethérien', p. 91.

<sup>94</sup> P. Classen, 'Das Konzil', pp. 355 ff.

<sup>95</sup> P. Classen, *Gerhoch v. Reichersberg* (Wiesbaden, 1960) 302, suggests that Peter accompanied Count Henry of Austria (1156-77), in whose service he was, on the Count's visit to Constantinople in May, 1166.

<sup>96</sup> It was written between March, 1166, and February, 1167.

<sup>97</sup> A. Dondaine, 'Hugues Ethérien et le concile', 480: Praedilecto et sapienti viro amico suo Petro Ugo Eterianus: In Domino semper gaudere...

<sup>98</sup> *Ep.* II; ed. Dondaine, p. 131, line 27: Hic primo tuam notitiam cordi meo infixit.

<sup>99</sup> Haskins, *Studies*, p. 212, affirms that Peter "accompanied him." A. Dondaine, 'Hugues', p. 90, disagrees because "il n'est pas évident..."

<sup>1</sup> *Ep.* III; ed. Dondaine, pp. 131-132.

<sup>2</sup> *Ep.* III, ed. Dondaine, p. 131, line 10: vestrum ac meum amicum.

He requests from Hugh Etherian a translation of passages gathered from "Greek theologians, passages which clearly teach that one must distinguish between nature and person."<sup>3</sup> In explaining his problem, Master Peter adopts the terminology of St. Hilary: the divinity is the *natura rei*, God its *res naturae*.

But Hugh did not experience the pleasure of handing the letter to the admired Pisan in Constantinople. When he departed from Peter he was full of joy and eager expectation despite the "hardships and dangers" such a journey involved: *Hilariter in Illyricum et auide viam nullis laboribus et periculis meis inviam arripui*.<sup>4</sup> He tells us that for some time he had been praying that God might "lay open to him the path of truth"<sup>5</sup> and grant him the grace to drink at the fountain-head of all Latin learning, the wisdom of Greece.<sup>6</sup> Amid so much discord in matters theological, he felt, the "unshakeable *auctoritates*" of Greece would put an end to all dissension. To achieve this goal at long last nothing would discourage him from undertaking "the long and perilous journey." Had not Jerome in his love for theology and in order to slake his thirst for Greek learning left Italy and journeyed through Asia to find Gregory of Nazianzus in Greece? Had not Pythagoras gone to the sages of Memphis in Egypt, and Plato to Arcytas in Taranto? Had people not come from far-away places to see and hear Titus Livius? Did not St. Peter visit St. Paul?<sup>7</sup> Hugh does not wish to give the impression of comparing himself to such great men. No, his only desire was to see and hear men of outstanding wisdom and known for their learning that he might become like one of them, at least by imitation.<sup>8</sup> He was not "inflated by the glory" of his Prince.<sup>9</sup>

But "Fortune's malice" ruined it all by denying him the delight of an interview. Hugh Etherian refused to see him. To the imperial legate the rebuff was a source of greater grief than the denial of all the honours this life could have caused him.<sup>10</sup> If he was at fault, he was willing to undergo due punishment. And even without knowing the reason Hugh pleads for forgiveness.<sup>11</sup> When Hugh realized that the Pisan refused to

<sup>3</sup> *Ibidem*, lines 14-15.

<sup>4</sup> Haskins, *Studies*, p. 210.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 210: *Beatissimae divinitati... supplicari coepi ut viam veritatis mihi panderet.*

<sup>6</sup> *Ibidem*.

<sup>7</sup> *Ep. I*; ed. Dondaine, p. 129, lines 13-21.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibidem*.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibidem*, lines 24-26.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibidem*, lines 26-27: *Sed fortunae malignitas votis meis obstitit tuique copiam non minori mihi dolore abstulit quam si vitae huius summos honores denegasset...*

<sup>11</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 129, lines 29-30.

speaking to him, he turned to Master Roger (*Rudegerus*), an imperial interpreter, who happened to be in Constantinople.<sup>12</sup> He wrote down the questions he had intended to submit to the learned Pisan and asked Master Roger to deliver the questionnaire.<sup>13</sup> The answer, Hugh was certain, would "enlighten" not only his own ignorance but also the entire Latin world.<sup>14</sup>

The height of Hugh's expectation may serve as a measure of the depth of his disappointment. As he returned to the West, to Germany, he remained determined to clear up the strange affair. Two of his letters written after his return testify to this determination. At the same time they raise some problems concerning the exact sequence of events. The first of the two letters presupposes Hugh's ignorance of the motives for Hugh Etherian's distressing behaviour and posits Master Roger's return to Germany, for we learn from the second letter that Roger helped him to recall the questions submitted to Hugh Etherian in Constantinople.<sup>15</sup> Hence we may suppose that Master Roger took the first letter along with him on his next mission to Constantinople.<sup>16</sup> The greetings in this letter from Peter, "your most intimate friend," may allow us to infer that Barbarossa's legate had met Peter again on his way back to Germany.

Master Roger, it seems, stayed in the East for some time and then returned with more accurate information. The desired compilation of Greek *auctoritates* was already so close to completion that Hugh could notify its author in the next letter to the effect that his present letter carrier, Bartholomew, would call for the *schedulae* and bring them back to him and Master Peter.<sup>17</sup> One reason for this gratifying turn of events was, no doubt, the end of the schism in 1177. Hugh Etherian had told Master Roger that he was incensed by the imperial legate because his own name had appeared after rather than before the legate's name. "If that was the reason", Hugh writes in his second letter, I wish to point

<sup>12</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 129, lines 34-35: *magistrum Rudegerum, imperialis linguae in nostram et litterarum interpretem.*

<sup>13</sup> This document is lost.

<sup>14</sup> *Ep. I*; ed. Dondaine, p. 129, lines 33-34: *ut non tam imperitiam meam quam totam latinitatem in his quaestionibus illumines.*

<sup>15</sup> *Ep. II*; p. 131, lines 21-23: *in his quaestionibus quas per Rudegerum praefatum et Constantinopoli tibi porrexi et postea per eundem a Germania in memoriam reduxi.* See the remark, *ibidem*, p. 129, line 37: *Hae sunt autem quaestiones si memini...*

<sup>16</sup> In the second letter (*Ibidem*, p. 130, lines 9-10) there is a remark which would seem to confirm this: *Dederam quidem ei litteras, apologon ignorantiae meae continentes, tuae celsitudini ferendas.*

<sup>17</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 131, line 25: *Lator praesentium Bartholomaeus schedulas tuas mihi reportabit et magistro Petro...*



out that this "was not my fault but the scribe's"<sup>18</sup> He did not really believe that the question of precedence was the true reason for the Pisan's "indignation." "I know," Hugh declares, "that I did not deserve to be admitted to your presence because you knew, though you did not say it, that I arrived during the schism which all Germany seemed to support by declining to accept Pope Alexander. Hence the holiness of your religious conviction would not allow itself to be stained by communication with me."<sup>19</sup> Although Hugh's letter does not refer to the end of the schism, the writer seems to treat it as a thing of the past. Since the peace of Venice in July 1177 ended the schism, the date of Hugh's second letter may well be 1177, or rather 1178.

The year 1178 is, in fact, preferable because the later date explains better why Hugh, and not Bartholomew, brought the Pisan's book to the West. It was indeed a happy moment when he found how many Greek authors favoured the view of his Master Gilbert. "Since the Latins," he tells us, "do not know how clearly the wisdom of the Greeks speaks about these things,"<sup>20</sup> I have considered it all worth the effort so that I may now say publicly what I have received with God's help from their orthodox doctors, that is to say how through them it is evident that he (Gilbert) did not deviate from the path of truth, evident that his rivals were going astray in the mists of ignorance, evident also that they worked in vain to defeat him who, as is now well established, rested solidly on the loftiest and unshaken columns of Greece."<sup>21</sup> The book, we are told, was compiled "with great diligence and care" and Gilbert's thesis was "supported by the *auctoritates* of Basil the Great, Gregory Nazianzen, and others."<sup>22</sup>

The psychological impact of Hugh Etherian's "little book" on the imperial legate is well known to readers of his introduction. In his first letter he writes: "Since all wisdom has flowed to us from the fountain-head of the Greeks, and since God has placed you before us as a man endowed with the most impressive evidence of both Latin and Greek

<sup>18</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 130, lines 11-12: non ex meo sed ex scriptoris vitio accidit... Hugh may have lacked the delicate circumspection of the perfect diplomat. In his first letter to Hugh Etherian he refers to Manuel as *Orientalis Regni gubernatorem* which must have had a rather unpleasant ring at the court of an emperor whose aim was to become the ruler of a reunited East and West. On a later occasion Hugh calls Manuel *basileon regum orientalium potentissimum* (Haskins, *Studies*, p. 210). As to the "scribe's mistake," Hugh may well have felt himself entitled to the first place, considering that he represented the Emperor Frederick.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 130, lines 13-17.

<sup>20</sup> He means the distinction between nature and person in God.

<sup>21</sup> Haskins, *Studies*, p. 211.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 210.

learning of our time, I implore you to dispel the dangerous doubts of the Latins... with the *auctoritates* of the Greek doctors who have spoken more clearly than our own.”<sup>23</sup> In anticipation of his final triumph he states in his next letter: “Would to God you knew that to your eternal memory your name will be passed on with the highest words of praise if you carry out what that friend of yours (Peter) and I ask of you, and if you put into effect what you have promised.”<sup>24</sup>

The literary impact of the “little book” on Hugh of Honau is best shown by comparing the *auctoritates* used in his two works. The first of Hugh’s two works is the *Liber de homousion et homoeusion*. It aims at the clarification of such concepts as substance, person, essence, existence, divinity, and many others. He supports his statements by citing “the *auctoritates* of the holy doctors of the Church.”<sup>25</sup> In doing so, he warns us, repetitions of quotations could not be avoided. Hugh displays an impressive knowledge of the pertinent literature. He cites Alcuin (under the name of St. Augustine), St. Ambrose, Aristotle’s *Categories*, *Topics* and *Physics*, Athanasius (in reality Vigilius of Thapsus and the *Quicumque*), St. Augustine, Bede, Boethius, the Canon of the Mass, Chalcidius, the councils of Braga (I) and Toledo (XI), Galen, the *Historia Tripartita* (under the names of Socrates, Sozomenus, Theodoret), St. John Damascene, the *Church History* of Eusebius, Gregory of Nazianzus, Pope Gregory I, Haimo, St. Hilary, Pope Hormisdas, Jerome, Leo I, Maximus, Origen (or rather John Scotus Erigena), Pelagius II, Porphyry, Prosper (in reality Pomerius), Priscian, Sophronius, Statius, Theodoret, Victorinus, Pope Vigilius (in reality Vigilius, *Contra Eutychem*).

St. Hilary, of course, heads the list with some 299 quotations, mostly (194) from his *De Synodis*. St. Augustine follows with a total of 137 (less than half of St. Hilary’s), including such spurious attributions as Alcuin and others. “Athanasius” is quoted 48 times, Victorinus 31 times, Boethius 30 times, Aristotle 25 times, thus surpassing St. Ambrose (13 quotations), St. Jerome (5 quotations), the popes, the councils, and others.

It is obvious that the East is well represented in this list. But it is equally evident that, with the exception of Aristotle’s *Physics*, the translations from the Greek had been commonly known and available for a considerable time. Although Peter Lombard was not particularly popular with the Porretans, Hugh seems to have copied St. John Damascene from Lombard’s *Sentences*.

<sup>23</sup> *Ep. I*; ed. Dondaine, p. 130, lines 54-58.

<sup>24</sup> *Ep. II*; *ibidem*, p. 131, lines 28-30.

<sup>25</sup> MS Cambridge, *Univ. Lib.* Ii.4.27, fol. 2<sup>v</sup>.

Hugh of Honau wrote a second work under the significant title: *Liber de diversitate naturae et personae*.<sup>26</sup> Its introduction has been known for many years.<sup>27</sup> In this preface Hugh of Honau leaves no doubt that he is a staunch supporter of his Master Gisilbert. In its present form the work is incomplete, perhaps because death intervened. Its particular purpose is to show that even in God nature and person must not be considered identical in every respect. Hugh proudly proclaims that with the help of Hugh Etherian he now has the added support of "Basil the Great, Gregory Nazianzen, and others"<sup>28</sup> to show that the distinction demanded by Gilbert is justified.

Although in its known, extant form Hugh's work is far from complete,<sup>29</sup> it resembles the previous one in many respects. In its 47 folios, St. Hilary is quoted 178, St. Augustine some 90 times, including Alcuin, Fulgentius, and other spurious attributions. Next in number is Boethius with 53 quotations all of which are taken from the *opuscula sacra*. The so-called *Apologeticus*, viz., the sermons of St. Gregory of Nazianzus translated by Rufinus, is cited 28 times, mostly in the opening chapters which deal with the teaching of theology. "St. Athanasius" is represented with 18 quotations (all taken from Vigilius of Thapsus), St. Jerome with 15 (mostly spurious), St. Ambrose with 14, St. Basil with 13, and St. John Damascene with 10 quotations. Victorinus is cited 4 times, much less than in the previous work.

The fact that St. Basil who does not appear at all in the previous work is now quoted as often as 13 times, including repetitions of the same text, is due to the *Liber de differentia naturae et personae* compiled by Hugh Etherian for the imperial legate and Master Peter of Vienna. This *Liber de differentia* also accounts for five texts from an entirely new arrival in Latin theology, Anastasius Sinaita (*Viae Dux*). The same *Liber* accounts for a short text attributed to St. Gregory, Bishop of Nyssa, under the spurious title: *Ad Aulalium*. Another quotation found in the same source dates back to a *Homily on the Holy Spirit* by Gregory Nazianzen, called the Theologian.

Perhaps even more remarkable is a text from the *Expositio Fidei* of Gregory Thaumaturgus, an extremely rare Greek authority among the

<sup>26</sup> Haskins, *Studies*, p. 210

<sup>27</sup> *Ibidem*, pp. 210-212.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 210.

<sup>29</sup> It was to have been divided into several *distinctiones*, but, as preserved in MS Cambridge, Univ. Lib. II.4.27, fols. 130-177<sup>v</sup>, the text breaks off before the completion of the first *distinctio*.

Latins despite the fact that Rufinus had already translated it. Didymus the Blind is cited once in the translation of St. Jerome. Hugh quotes two texts from Pseudo-Denis. He quotes them as being found in *tertio Hierarchiae*, though they are both taken from the *De divinis nominibus*. Popes are cited on several occasions: Pope Hormisdas twice, "Pope Vigilius" (in reality Vigilius, *Contra Eutychen*) four times, Pope Leo I and Pope Pelagius II once each. The eleventh Council of Toledo provides the only conciliar text. Two texts, attributed to Origen, are actually derived from John Scotus Erigena. Sophronius is cited eight times, but Theodoret only once. In the previous work Sophronius is quoted twelve times and Theodoret six times.

Gilbert of Poitiers is highly praised in the preface but not mentioned in the text. Several borrowings from Gilbert are quite obvious, however. Hugh of Saint Victor is quoted as *expositor*. It is also worth mentioning that Aristotle's *Physics*, quoted so copiously in the first work, does not appear again, though the *Categories* are cited 3 times. Both Plato and Porphyry are quoted 3 times each. Statius occurs again, obviously quoted from memory as *quidam poeta*.

This summary indicates that Hugh copied certain texts from his previous work. It also shows that, thanks to Hugh Etherian's cooperation, even more room than before is given to the Greek Fathers. To some degree, it should be added, Hugh Etherian's compilation may have come as a disappointment to Hugh of Honau, for he does not quote a single text from it in which it is said in so many words that in God nature and person are not identical. This omission is partly if not entirely due to the fact that Hugh of Honau must have hesitated to quote such names as Theodorus Abucaras and Leontius Byzantinus, names undoubtedly just as strange to Latin theologians as Anastasius Sinaita. It may, on the other hand, be just as surprising to find that not even Theodoret's famous testimony is quoted, although Hugh's first treatise shows that he was familiar with the text.<sup>30</sup> If there were shortcomings in Hugh Etherian's contribution to the Latin dossier of Greek *auctoritates*, the imperial legate did not admit it. On the contrary he thanked God's goodness for the support received through it from the Greek Fathers.

To evaluate briefly the accomplishment of our Porretans with regard to a more intensive study of Greek patristic thought,<sup>31</sup> it is not enough to

<sup>30</sup> MS Cambridge, *Univ. Lib.* II.4.27, fol. 54v: Dixit beatus Theodoritus: Qui enim naturam... confusionem Sabellii. It is also contained in the long excerpt from Theodoret found on fols. 18-19: PG 83, 1169A-1170C.

<sup>31</sup> J. de Ghellinck, 'L'histoire de *persona* et d'*hypostasis* dans un écrit anonyme porrétaïn du

know what was actually available in Latin translations<sup>32</sup> at a time when the average library in the West could hardly afford the complete works of St. Augustine. But the list of works translated from the Greek<sup>33</sup> should be supplemented by a list of the numerous collections of conciliar acts in which the Greek Fathers often speak more loudly, as it were, than their Latin counterparts. It is, for instance, safe to say that St. Cyril was known to Latin writers, including St. Thomas, through letters and excerpts found in conciliar acts and canonical collections, not through translations of individual books composed by St. Cyril.<sup>34</sup> Moreover, one should not underestimate the great mass of information on theological problems contained in the *Historia ecclesiastica tripartita*, quoted so copiously by Hugh of Honau. There he found letters and fragments of letters written by Alexander of Alexandria, Arius, Eusebius of Cesarea, Athanasius (the real Athanasius), Eustathius of Antioch and others. He found them in the midst of extremely interesting accounts of the doctrinal struggles during the early centuries. Hugh, no doubt, had personally studied the work and used it. And yet where were the works of the great Athanasius available in Latin?<sup>35</sup>

We have seen that Geoffrey calls Athanasius "our theologian", and that the Porretans were quite eager to quote him. They did not realize that

XII<sup>e</sup> siècle', *Rev. néoscol. de phil.* 36 (1934) 127, writes of Hugh of Honau: "Il est verbeux, diffus, et peu original, c'est vrai. Par contre, il a un bon nombre de fragments grecs, surtout de S. Basil avec quelques-uns de S. Sophrone et de Théodoret, que l'Occident ne connaissait pas jusque-là; c'est une documentation patristique originale, à laquelle s'ajoute celle de Grégoire de Nazianze, qu'il peut s'être procurée directement. De plus, et c'est là qu'il reprend quelque titre à l'originalité, la défense des thèses gilbertines, dans les dernières années du XII<sup>e</sup> siècle, par des autorités grecques, dénote quelques vues personnelles, qui donne une place spéciale à son œuvre dans l'histoire du porréanisme. A ce titre aussi, il mérite d'être étudié." Well worth reading in this context is the chapter entitled: 'Les voies d'accès des Latins à la théologie trinitaire grecque' in A. Malet, "Personne et amour dans la théologie de Saint Thomas d'Aquin," *Bibl. Thom.* 32 (Paris, 1956) 161 ff.

<sup>32</sup> Cf. A. Siegmund, *Die Ueberlieferung der griech. christl. Literatur in der lat. Kirche bis zum zwölften Jahrh.* (Munich, 1949).

<sup>33</sup> Cf. J. T. Muckle, 'Greek Works translated Directly into Latin before 1350', *MSt* 4 (1942) 33-42, and (1943) 102-114.

<sup>34</sup> Cf. N. M. Haring, 'The Character and Range of the Influence of St. Cyril of Alexandria on Latin Theology', *MSt* 12 (1950) 1-19.

<sup>35</sup> B. Altaner, 'Die altlat. Uebersetzungen von Schriften des Athanasios von Alexandria', *Byz. Zeitschr.* 41 (1941) 45-59. In addition to the extremely popular *Vita s. Antonii*, tr. by Evagrius, and the famous letter to Epictetus (PL 54, 664-675), some letters are found in MS Florence, *Bibl. Laur.* 584 (s. IX-X). The *florilegium* attached to St. Leo's *Ep.* 165 contains a short excerpt from Athanasius' letter to Epictetus (PL 54, 1178AB). This passage is later quoted by John of Seville in the middle of the ninth century (*Ep.* III, 6; PL 121, 425B), copied from the *Hispana*, 60; PL 84, 739B.

their attributions were spurious. Many manuscripts containing the works of Vigilius of Thapsus provided them with such titles as: *Altercatio sancti Athanasii contra Arium*, *Sabellium vel Fotinum hereticum* or *Sancti Athanasii de Trinitate libri VIII* or *Liber de Spiritu sancto*.<sup>36</sup> These are the very titles quoted by our Porretans Adhemar and Hugh of Honau. Abelard,<sup>37</sup> the *Summa Sententiarum*,<sup>38</sup> Peter Lombard,<sup>39</sup> and many others had fallen victim to the same spurious attributions.<sup>40</sup>

Peter Lombard makes no mention of St. Basil, although Rufinus<sup>41</sup>

<sup>36</sup> MS Rouen 425 (A 178), s. XII, from Fécamp (A 379). *Cat. Gén.* 1 (Paris, 1886) 82. MS Troyes 895, s. XII, from Clairvaux: *Disputatio fidei inter Arium et Athanasium*. *Cat. Gén.* 4<sup>o</sup>, 2 (Paris, 1855) 370. See also MS Troyes 2405, s. VIII-IX, Bouhier E. 28: *Altercatio s. Athanasii contra Arium*. An addition to Cassiodorus' *Institutiones* (PL 70, 1122C) reads: *Legenda sunt etiam dicta s. Athanasii ad cognoscendam veritatem catholicae fidei. Ad Epictetum epistolam unam in capitulis quatuor. De Sacramento fidei. De Incarnatione Domini. De Spiritu sancto. Epistola fidei suae ad Theodosium Aquilejam missa. Altercatio ejus contra Sabellium et Photinum. Ejusdem altercatio contra Arium*. Cassiodorus, *Inst.* I, 4; ed. Mynors (Oxford, 1937) 21, mentions only a *libellus Athanasii... de libro psalmorum*. The claim made by J. M. Déchanet, *Guillaume de Saint-Thierry* (Bruges, 1942) 102 and 203, that William used Athanasius, *De Sent. Dion.* and *Ep. ad. Serap.* in *Aenigma fidei* (PL 180, 429BD), is extremely doubtful. O. Brooke, 'The speculative Development of the Trinitarian Theology of William of St. Thierry in the Aenigma Fidei', *Rech. de théol. anc. et méd.* 18 (1961) 49, is much more reserved in this regard. It may finally be noted that Pseudo-Vigilius, *De Trinitate* XI (PL 62, 299D) was already attributed to Athanasius by St. Augustine, *Ep.* 148, 2, 10. Cf. P. Courcelle, *Les lettres grecques en Occident de Macrobe à Cassiodore* (Paris, 1943) 188. B. Altaner, 'Augustinus und Athanasius', *Rev. Bén.* 59 (1949) 85 f.

<sup>37</sup> Cf. *Sic et Non*, 8; PL 178, 1362A: Athanasius, *de Trinitate* lib. VI, cap. II: *Maledictus...* *Sic et Non*, 17 and 18 (1375C): Athanasius, *de Trinitate* lib. VIII; (1378BC): Athanasius... See also *Sic et Non*, 80-81; PL 178, 1463D and 1465 BC. In the same work Abelard quotes Origen (1363A; 1377BC; 1387A; 1429B; 1468D; 1481A; 1516A; 1590C; 1594BC, Chrysostom (1369BC; 1373D; 1393BC; 1472D; 1474D; 1494A; 1512D; 1566A; 1582C; 1585B; 1586B; 1590C; 1609A), Hermas (1559A), Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* (1492A; 1488D), and Amphilochius, *De vita et miraculis s. Basilii* (1525C).

<sup>38</sup> *Summa Sent.* I, 19; PL 176, 80A.

<sup>39</sup> The quotation from "Athanasius" in *Sent.* III, 21, 1; ed. Quaracchi (1916) 646, is copied from the *Summa Sententiarum*.

<sup>40</sup> The Latins had certain doubts concerning the author of the *Symbolum Athanasii 'Quicumque'*. But as Hugh Etherian testifies, the Greeks of his day denounced it openly as spurious. A. Dondaine, 'Hugues Ethérien et le concile', p. 482: *Ad haec benignitati tuae notum esse volui quod beati Athanasii catholicae fidei confessionem Graecia pro ficto et falso reputat*. We learn from John Belet, *Rationale div. offic.*, 40; PL 202, 50A, that many considered Anastasius its author. In MS Arras 721, s. XIII, we find an *expositio symboli Athanasii Papae*. *Cat. Gén.* 4<sup>o</sup>, 4 (Paris, 1872) 287.

<sup>41</sup> B. Altaner, 'Beiträge zur Gesch. der altlat. Uebersetzungen von Väterschriften' *Hist. Jahrb.* 61 (1941) 208-210. M. Huglo, 'Les anciennes versions latines des homélies de Saint Basile', *Rev. Bén.* 64 (1954) 129-132. D. Amand, 'Une ancienne version latine inédite de deux homélies de Saint Basile', *Rev. Bén.* 57 (1947) 12-81. See the translations by Rufinus in PC 31, 1723-1784.

had translated a number of St. Basil's homilies and his *Epistola ad virginem lapsam*. At least five of St. Basil's letters dealing with trinitarian problems had existed in Latin translations as early as the tenth century.<sup>42</sup> Nevertheless even Hugh of Honau did not mention St. Basil until he received Hugh Etherian's compilation which contained several valuable texts from St. Basil's works. At least St. Basil's name must have been familiar through the rather popular *Regula sancti Basilii*. For that reason it would seem very unlikely that Master Peter of Vienna wilfully distorted *Basilius* to *basiliscus*,<sup>43</sup> although Gerhoch of Reichersberg accuses him of such a distortion. It was, to be sure, nothing but a scribal error.

Our Porretans studied Didymus the Blind, once a popular author among Carolingian theologians.<sup>44</sup> His popularity, however, did not last. It was his work *On the Holy Spirit*, translated by St. Jerome,<sup>45</sup> that deserved more lasting attention, but the only quotation from Didymus found in the *Sentences*<sup>46</sup> is copied from Abelard.<sup>47</sup> Abelard, in turn, seems to have copied it not from the original but from another writer.

On the other hand, St. John Chrysostom who is well represented in Lombard's *Sentences* is not quoted at all by our Porretans.<sup>48</sup> The reason

<sup>42</sup> In the collection of MS Florence, *Laur.* 584: *Epp.* 24; 52; 173; 197; 236. The *florilegium* attached to St. Leo's Ep. 165 (PL 54, 1185) contains a text from St. Basil. See also ACO II, 4, 125, no. 14 and ACO IV, 2, 74-96.

<sup>43</sup> Gerhoch of Reichersberg, *Ep. ad Petrum philosophum*; ed. P. Classen, in D. Van den Eynde, *Gerhohi Opera inedita* I (Rome, 1955) 359: sanctus Basilius quem tu ore profano basiliscum nominas.

<sup>44</sup> Theodulph of Orleans (d. 821), *De Spiritu sancto* cites "Athanasius", Cyril, Didymus, and Proclus (PL 105, 242A; 247C; 253A; 273A). Alcuin, *De proc. s. Spiritus* cites "Gregory of Nazianzus or of Nyssa", Cyril, Athanasius (*Quicumque*), Gregory of Nazianzus, Athanasius in *altercatione* quam cum Ario habuit (PL 101, 66D; 70B; 73C; 77C; 81A).

<sup>45</sup> Some manuscripts of the work are listed by A. Siegmund, *Die Ueberlieferung*, pp. 66-67.

<sup>46</sup> *Sent.* I, 11, 2; p. 80: Athanasius in *Symbolo Fidei*, Didymus, *De Spiritu sancto*, Cyrillus in *Epistola Nestorio directa*, Johannes Chrysostomus in *homilia quadam de expositione symboli*.

<sup>47</sup> *Theologia 'Scholarium'* II; PL 178, 1077AD: Anastasius in *symbolo fidei*, Didymus... in libro *De Spiritu sancto*... *Symbolum Ephesini Concilii*... Cyrillus episcopus Alexandrinus in *ep.* 8, Nestorio directa... Johannes Chrysostomus *homilia* 27, *De expositione symboli*. See also Abelard, *Theologia 'Summi Boni'* IV; PL 178, 1302C-1303C: Athanasius in *symbolo fidei*, Didymus... in libro *De Spiritu sancto*... in *symbolo Ephesini Concilii*... Cyrillus Alexandrinus episcopus in *epistola* 8, Nestorio directa... Johannes Chrysostomus *homilia* 26, *De expositione symboli*... Abelard's influence is quite evident in the answer given by Anselm of Havelberg (d. 1158) in his celebrated debate in Constantinople with Archbishop Niketas of Nicomedia (spring, 1136). See the *Dial.* II, 27; PL 188, 1202D: Athanasius... in *symbolo fidei*... Didymus... in libro *De Spiritu sancto*... *symbolum Ephesini Concilii* ducentorum episcoporum... Cyrillus episcopus Alexandrinorum in *epistola* 8, Nestorio directa... Johannes Chrysostomus *homilia* 25, *De expositione symboli*.

<sup>48</sup> Concerning translations and spurious attributions see A. Wilmart, 'La collection des 38

for this omission is a matter of speculation. Perhaps more surprising is the fact that not only Gregory of Nyssa but also Gregory of Nazianzus are absent from the *Sentences*. Gregory Nazianzen's nine homilies translated by Rufinus<sup>49</sup> contain a great deal of doctrinal matter concerning the Holy Trinity and were, moreover, not at all rare in early Mediaeval libraries.<sup>50</sup> Both Lombard and our Porretans failed to make use of Gregory of Nyssa's *De creatione hominis* which was available in two Latin translations.<sup>51</sup> And to name yet another Gregory, Origen's disciple, called Thaumaturgus, one may even venture the claim that before Hugh of Honau no Latin theologian had ever made use of his now famous *Expositio fidei* translated by Rufinus.

Since Peter Lombard had attended the Consistory of Reims he must at least have heard the names of Theodoret and Sophronius unless he too had difficulties similar to those of which Geoffrey complains. Neither Theodoret nor Sophronius occur in the *Sentences*. But it would be useless, though perhaps interesting, to speculate how the numerous commentators of the *Sentences* would have dealt with Theodoret's categorical statement that unless some distinction is admitted between nature and person in God there are but two alternatives: Arianism or Sabellianism.

By a peculiar stroke of irony the Origen of our Porretans is John Scotus Erigena whose commentary on St. John was circulated under the name of Origen.<sup>52</sup> Needless to say, Origen was extremely popular among Latin theologians in the twelfth century. Through Lombard's initiative another Greek Father, St. John Damascene, began to exercise a strong influence in the West. Although Hugh of Honau offers a number of excerpts from the *De Fide orthodoxa* (III, 4-6) in both of his works, there is no trace of it in Canon Adhemar's compilation.

It should finally be noted that in these groping attempts at closer contact with the Eastern Fathers situations arose with which the average

homélies latines de Saint Jean Chrysostome', *Journ. of Theol. Studies* 19 (1917-18) 305-327. The *incipits* given by Abelard are not found among those 38 homilies. See also B. Altaner, 'Beiträge', pp. 212-226. J. T. Muckle, 'Greek Works', p. 37.

<sup>49</sup> Hugh of Honau and a number of manuscripts refer to the collection as *Apologeticus*, the title of the first sermon.

<sup>50</sup> See A. Siegmund, *Die Ueberlieferung*, pp. 83 ff.

<sup>51</sup> Dionysius Exiguus (PL 67, 347-408) and John Scotus Erigena. Cf. A. Siegmund, *Die Ueberlieferung*, p. 85. J. Daniélou, 'Saint Bernard et les Pères Grecs', *Analecta s. O. Cist.* 9, 2 (1953) 52-55, shows that St. Bernard used the work.

<sup>52</sup> Cf. M. Cappuyens, *Jean Scot Erigène* (Louvain, 1933) 231 f. F. Stegmüller, *Rep. Bibl.* 3 (Madrid, 1951) 427, no. 4959, lists three MSS in which the work is attributed to Origen.



Latins, including the highly trained Porretans, were unable to cope. Hugh Etherian presented Hugh of Honau with texts from Anastasius (Sinaita) whose very existence must have been unknown to the imperial legate. In quoting Anastasius as "a man of great holiness among the Greeks", Hugh of Honau trusted the veracity of the admired Pisan, Hugh Etherian.<sup>53</sup> At the same time, he may have wondered how far the Latins might be prepared to go in their willingness to accept the authority of Eastern writers. In fact, he must have wondered who Leontius Byzantinus was, not to mention Theodorus Abucaras, both of whom are cited in Hugh Etherian's compilation. No wonder then if he decided not to quote them among his *auctoritates*, although both of them strongly support the demand for a distinction between nature and person in God.

It would not be fair to our Porretans if in describing their vigorous quest for Greek learning we failed to draw due attention to their discovery of the African C. Marius Victorinus whom Hugh of Honau quotes some 31 times in his *Liber de homousion* and some 6 times in his *Liber de diversitate*. It took more than ordinary courage to seek to penetrate an author<sup>54</sup> of whom St. Jerome once wrote: Victorinus... scripsit *Adversus Arium* libros more dialectico valde obscuros qui nisi ab eruditis non intelliguntur.<sup>55</sup> To a Porretan such a warning could only mean a challenge, for he was trained and inspired by a man who had spent his life not only in *legendo et tritura litterarum*, as John of Salisbury<sup>56</sup> puts it, not only in teaching according to the most demanding standards of his day, but also in broadening the horizons by turning his eyes to the

<sup>53</sup> Hugh of Honau, *Liber de diversitate*; MS Cambridge, *Univ. Lib.* II.4.27, f. 145: Hinc Anastasius vir magnae sanctitatis apud Graecos. Hugh Etherian, *Liber de differentia*, fol. 37: vir magnae sanctitatis Anastasius.

<sup>54</sup> E. Gilson, *Hist. of Christ. Phil. in the Middle Ages* (New York, 1955) 67, opens his chapter on Victorinus with the statement: "The Christian writings of Marius Victorinus have not yet been critically edited, nor, therefore, properly studied. In the present condition of the texts, no safe interpretation of his doctrine is possible." In addition to these intrinsic difficulties, the Mediaeval student was faced with many garbled Greek words which the Latin scribes reproduced with greatly varying accuracy. A critical edition is now available in the collection: *Sources chrétiennes*, 68-69: Paul Henry and Pierre Hadot, *Cajus Marius Victorinus: Traité théologique sur la Trinité*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1960).

<sup>55</sup> Jerome, *De viris ill.*, 101; PL 23, 739A. Concerning Alcuin's use of M. Victorinus, see P. Hadot, 'Marius Victorinus et Alcuin', *Arch. d'hist. doctr. et litt.* 29 (1954) 5-19. A text from Victorinus is also quoted by Hincmar, *De una et non trina deitate*, 6; PL 125, 536C: Non ita... intellexit Victorinus rhetor urbis Romae et magister beati Hieronymi scribens ad Candidum Arianum... inter caetera: Si, inquit, istorum trium unum... et solum est.

<sup>56</sup> *Hist. Pont.*, 8; ed. Poole, p. 17.

Light from the East. Indeed, a great teacher he must have been who could instill into his followers such loyalty and zeal for the truth wherever it might be found.

All our present knowledge points to the unpleasant conclusion that by the end of the twelfth century an organized group of Porretans existed no longer. Yet one may be inclined to ponder and wonder how immeasurable the benefits might have been for the Church and all mankind if that avid search for truth, that humble willingness to listen to the voice of the East which animated the Porretans had been more widespread among the Latins.

To sum up, let us listen to Hugh of Honau's prayer: "I shall never cease to say thanks, as well as I can, to the goodness of God who deigned to put an end to my long sighing and uneasiness of mind so that I must now hold with Cyril of Alexandria<sup>57</sup> and John of Damascus that person and nature are not the same — and with Basil the Great and Gregory the Theologian that the personal properties, person, and essence are not the same. Indeed, the Bishop of Poitiers, mentioned above, clearly affirmed this in his *Exposition of Boethius' De Trinitate* in full accord with his predecessor Hilary, although he did not point out what authors he used, leaving the satisfaction of finding them to the readers well versed in the divine writings. In the prologue to his work he encourages their loving endeavour to find them, saying that it may seem to the attentive reader of his works that what he said was stolen by him rather than invented."<sup>58</sup>

*Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies*

<sup>57</sup> His name does not appear elsewhere in Hugh's work.

<sup>58</sup> Haskins, *Studies*, p. 211.

\* My two articles in this volume represent a section of work done as a Fellow of the John Simon Guggenheim Foundation.

# The Marriages and the Wealth of the Wife of Bath

CECILE STOLLER MARGULIES

THE first introduction to the Wife of Bath in the General Prologue gives only a brief intimation of the lusty lady's colorful marital adventures. However, in the highly dramatic prologue to her tale she is primarily concerned with describing her relationships with her five husbands, three of whom were "goode men, and riche, and olde."<sup>1</sup> In each of her many marriages she used to best advantage all her marital rights, including her legal ones. Although her rights as a woman were quite limited and she was, legally, almost under the complete control of her husbands,<sup>2</sup> Alisoun shrewdly managed her affairs and the affairs of her husbands so as to gain for herself the greatest possible benefit.

According to civil and ecclesiastical law she did have certain rights, and her use of them formed an integral part of her marriages. As she describes her relationships with her five husbands, a great deal of what she says and does relates directly to the medieval laws of marriage, and to laws referring to legal actions between husbands and wives.<sup>3</sup>

In l. 460 of the General Prologue Chaucer says: "Housbondes at chirche dore she hadde fyve." He repeats this line again almost verbatim in l. 6 of the Wife of Bath's own prologue. The phrase "chirche dore" is not used merely as a figure of speech or as a picturesque detail, for it was at the door in front of the church that the ceremony actually took place,<sup>4</sup> and only by marriage at the church door could the Wife of

<sup>1</sup> Citations from Chaucer in my text are to *The Complete Works*, ed. Fred N. Robinson (Cambridge, 1957).

<sup>2</sup> W. S. Holdsworth, *A History of English Law* (Boston, 1923), III, 521; and Ranulph de Glanvill, *De Legibus et Consuetudinibus Regni Angliae*, ed. George E. Woodbine (New Haven, 1932) 89.

<sup>3</sup> This may, perhaps, be used to shed some additional light on the question of Chaucer's legal training. See, for example, Edith Rickert, 'Was Chaucer a Student at the Inner Temple,' *Manly Anniversary Studies* (Chicago, 1923) 20-31.

<sup>4</sup> Daniel Rock, *The Church of Our Fathers*, ed. G. W. Hart and W. H. Freere (London, 1905), IV, 200; also Walter W. Skeat, ed. *The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer* (Oxford, 1894), V, 44.

Bath gain the right to say "they had me yeven hir lond and hir tresoor" (D 204). The land and treasure of which she speaks was her dower, the gift she received from each husband at the time of marriage at the church door.<sup>5</sup> Testimony for this prevailing custom is found not only in literature but also in law books and in both lay and ecclesiastical legal writings.

In the Middle Ages the actual marriage was performed *ad ostium ecclesiae* and it was only the church service, the bridal-mass, that was held subsequently at the altar within the church.<sup>6</sup> This separation of marriage and mass was the last remainder of the distinction held in both Roman and Teutonic law between espousal and marriage.<sup>7</sup> As ecclesiastical law grew and the concept of the sacramental nature of marriage developed, the Church added religious jurisprudence to the older civil marriage laws of England. The existing legal character and the popular forms of betrothal and nuptials of England were not disturbed. The ceremonies required by temporal law were observed; only a new religious character was given to the existing rites.<sup>8</sup> Thus the English law of marriage became, with but little qualification, the law of the Catholic Church.<sup>9</sup> The older pagan laws, then, had filtered into both Church and State and were given full legal authority in the English Church Courts.<sup>10</sup>

The Church had to contend first with the Roman and then later with the Germanic marriage practices. In both Roman and Germanic customs, the marriage ritual was divided into two parts, each with its own

<sup>5</sup> Dower, the gift which the husband brought to the wife at the time of marriage and which was the provision made for the wife should she outlive her husband should not be confused with what we now call dowry — the settlement the wife brings to her husband.

<sup>6</sup> George E. Howard, *A History of Matrimonial Institutions* (Chicago, 1904), I, 299; A. Esmein, *Le mariage en droit canonique*, 2nd ed. (Paris, 1929-1935), I, 199-200. A. De Smet, *De Sponsalibus et Matrimonio* (Bruges, 1927), 172-173, states that a mass was always celebrated following a marriage, although the nuptial blessing was not given if such had been received in a former marriage.

<sup>7</sup> W. W. Fowler, 'Roman Marriage,' *The Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, VIII (New York, 1916) 464; also see George H. Joyce, S. J., *Christian Marriage* (London, 1948) 48 ff.; and Esmein, I, 200-02.

<sup>8</sup> See Howard, I, 291; Frederick Pollock and Frederic W. Maitland, *The History of English Law* (Cambridge, 1903), II, 369; H. D. Hazeltine, 'Canon Law,' *The Encyclopedia of Social Sciences* (New York, 1937), III, 185.

<sup>9</sup> Arthur Ogle, *The Church Law in Medieval England* (London, 1912), 53. This was also true for the general marriage law of Europe. This law was derived from decrees of church councils and edicts of Emperors until the Reformation. See Robert Phillimore, *The Ecclesiastical Law of the Church of England* (London, 1873), I, 707.

<sup>10</sup> Ogle, p. 53.

particular ceremonies. The *sponsalia*, or betrothal, in which the groom endowed his future wife, was the first part in the Roman ritual. The actual marriage, or *nuptiae*, was celebrated at a later time.<sup>11</sup> The Germanic ceremony consisted of the *bewedding*, at which a formal contract was drawn up with provisions for the bride, and the *gifta*, the actual "giving" of the bride to her husband.<sup>12</sup> The ancient customs which were the forerunners of Alisoun's marriage at the church door were thus divided into two distinct parts. However, by the tenth century the prevailing betrothal and nuptial rites were combined and the gift of dower was not only made part of the marriage ceremony but became its chief incident.<sup>13</sup> The gift was made according to the usual temporal forms before the church door, in the presence of the priest, who participated in the ceremony and closed it with his blessing.<sup>14</sup> A religious service was required in addition to the marriage, and this service took place within the church. This religious service was an invocation of divine blessing upon the life of the wedded couple but had no legal significance, for the nuptials had already been solemnized.<sup>15</sup>

This strict division of the ceremonies remained in effect because dower was secular business rather than ecclesiastical, and in recognition of the civil nature of wedlock the ceremony was performed before and not within the consecrated building.<sup>16</sup> This distinction can be seen in the details of the marriage ceremony which are given in the *Use of Sarum*. This manual was the standardized liturgical service of Salisbury, the See of Sarum, and was compiled between the late twelfth and early thirteenth century by Bishop Richard Poore.<sup>17</sup> A rubric of the manual directs that, "The man and the woman are to be placed before the door of the church, or in the face of the church, in the presence of God, and the priest, and the people..."<sup>18</sup> After the ceremony is completed, "they shall go into the church, as far as the altar."<sup>19</sup> There, after a psalm was

<sup>11</sup> Frederick Meyrick, 'Marriage,' *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities*, ed. William Smith and Samuel Cheetham (London, 1893), II, 1104.

<sup>12</sup> Howard, I, 269-72.

<sup>13</sup> Howard, I, 299. Indeed, in a text of Gratian (C. 30, q. 5, c. 6), the validity of a marriage is made dependent upon the constitution of the dower. (Edit. Friedberg, col. 1106); Esmein, I, 209-11.

<sup>14</sup> The wedding benediction was refused at a second marriage. This rule seems to have been dictated by the fact that the blessing should be given only to those who contract marriage in a state of virginity. See Esmein, II, 122.

<sup>15</sup> Howard, I, 298; Esmein, I, 118.

<sup>16</sup> Howard, I, 299; John C. Jeaffreson, *Brides and Bridals* (London, 1873), I, 52.

<sup>17</sup> *The Use of Sarum*, ed. Walter H. Frere (Cambridge, 1898), I, xix.

<sup>18</sup> *The Sarum Missal*, trans. Frederick E. Warren (London, 1913), II, 144.

<sup>19</sup> *Missal*, II, 149.

read, they prostrated themselves while a prayer was said in their behalf.<sup>20</sup>

Marriage at the door with the mass said inside was the prevailing custom of the Church in Western Christendom during the Middle Ages. Edward I married Margaret, sister of the King of France, at the door of Canterbury Cathedral on September 9, 1299.<sup>21</sup> Marriage was celebrated at the church door in England until the sixteenth century, when the liturgies of Edward VI and Elizabeth first required that the ceremony be performed inside the church.<sup>22</sup> Marriage in front of the church also prevailed in France even later than it did in England, for we know of the marriage of Charles I (1600-1649) by proxy to Henrietta Maria, daughter of Henry IV, at the door of Notre-Dame in Paris.<sup>23</sup>

When the Wife of Bath married each of her husbands at the church door she gained the legal right to claim a dower. Although marriage elsewhere might be valid, it was only at the church door that she could be endowed.<sup>24</sup> The assignment of dower at the church door was, in effect, an official notification of marriage at a period when registration did not exist. In addition, the practice served to discourage clandestine marriages and to insure proper claims later by making the acquisition of certain property rights depend upon publicity. This publicity was for the interest of both the bride and the groom's family. If, after surviving her husband, the wife should have difficulty in claiming her dower, she could be aided in enforcing her rights by persons who had

<sup>20</sup> *Missal*, II, 154.

<sup>21</sup> Henry Wharton's *Anglia Sacra* (London, 1691), I, 51, states: "Archiepiscopus Cantuariensis Robertus celebravit Sponsalia inter praedictum Regem Edwardum, et Margaretam sororem Regis Franciae in hostio Ecclesiae Christi Cantuariensis versus Claustrum juxta hostium Martyrii S. Thomae: et subsequenter idem archiepiscopus celebravit Missam Sponsalium ad altore feretri S. Thomae Martyris."

<sup>22</sup> Howard, I, 301.

<sup>23</sup> Jeaffreson, I, 59.

<sup>24</sup> Quando? Et sciendum, quod ante desponsationem, in initio contractus. Ubi? Et sciendum quod in facie ecclesiae, et ad ostium ecclesiae, non enim valet constitutio facta in lecto mortali, vel in camera, vel alibi, ubi clandestina fuerint conjugia, quia si non valeant clandestina conjugia heredibus quoad successionem, nunquam valebunt uxoribus ad dotis exactionem. Oportet igitur quod constitutio dotis sit facta publice, et cum solemnitate ad ostium ecclesiae, et ubi nullum omnino matrimonium, ibi nulla dos. Igitur videtur a contrario sensu, ubi matrimonium, ibi dos, quod quidem verum est, si matrimonium in facie ecclesiae contrahatur. Ad ostium ecclesiae fiat dotis constitutio inter quascunque personas consanguinitate vel affinitate conjunctas, vel extraneas, dum tamen matrimonium in vita contrahentium accusatum non fuerit, nec dissolutum. Si tamen accusatum et dissolutum quacunque ratione, desinit esse dos, cum deficiat matrimonium, et desinit esse dotis exactio. Nec debet aliquis ratione unius viri, in dotis petitione, duabus uxoribus respondere, Bracton, *De Legibus et Consuetudinibus Angliae* (London, 1640), Lib. ii, c. xxxix, n. 4.

heard the declaration of her dower.<sup>25</sup> On the other hand, such persons could appear in behalf of the family should the widow dishonestly demand more than her stipulated provision.<sup>26</sup>

The gift of dower, which was originally voluntary,<sup>27</sup> had, by the twelfth century, become a duty; every man was bound by ecclesiastical as well as secular law to endow his bride at the time of being affianced to her.<sup>28</sup> The endowment *ad ostium ecclesiae* was made by the husband himself at the moment of marriage.<sup>29</sup> Evidence for this practice exists in another rubric of the marriage ceremony of the Sarum manual, and in the writings of the fifteenth century civil lawyer, Littleton. The rubric states: "If, however, no impediment be alleged, the priest is to enquire about the dower of the woman."<sup>30</sup> In writing on this subject Littleton said, "When a man of full age... cometh to the church door to be married, there, after affiance and troth plighted between them, he endoweth the woman of his whole land, or of the half, or other lesser part thereof, and there openly doth declare the quantity and certainty of the land which she shall have for her dower."<sup>31</sup>

In endowing his bride, the husband could refer specifically to the lands he wished to bestow on her, thereby constituting a *dos nominata*. If no particular lands were named, he was understood to have endowed her with one-third of his lands, which was considered *dos rationabilis*, a reasonable dower.<sup>32</sup>

Although a wife could not be deprived of her right to the dower that was legally hers,<sup>33</sup> her husband had legal control over her body and her belongings during the length of her life.<sup>34</sup> The dower became hers immediately after her husband's death.<sup>35</sup>

<sup>25</sup> Glanvill, pp. 88-9.

<sup>26</sup> Jeaffreson, I, 54.

<sup>27</sup> Theodore Plucknett, *A Concise History of the Common Law* (London, 1956) 507.

<sup>28</sup> Glanvill, pp. 87-8; and Holdsworth, III, 189.

<sup>29</sup> Holdsworth, III, 190.

<sup>30</sup> *Missal*, II, 145.

<sup>31</sup> Holdsworth, III, 190.

<sup>32</sup> Pollock and Maitland, II, 420; Glanvill, pp. 88, 94. It is also interesting to note that an interpolation made in 1217 to Magna Carta assigns to a widow one-third of all her husband's lands unless a lesser endowment had been conferred at the church door: *Assignetur autem ei pro dote sua tertia pars totius terrae mariti sui quae sua fuit in vita sua, nisi de minori dotata fuerit ad ostium ecclesiae*. See D. J. Medley's *Original Illustrations of English Constitutional History* (London, 1926), 31.

<sup>33</sup> Holdsworth, III, 189; Pollock and Maitland, II, 404.

<sup>34</sup> Holdsworth, III, 521.

<sup>35</sup> Holdsworth, III, 189.

In talking of her loves, Alisoun says in her prologue (ll. 622-6),

I ne loved nevere by no discrecioun,  
But evere folwede myn appetit,  
Al were he short, or long, or blak, or whit;  
I took no kep, so that he liked me,  
How poore he was, ne eek of what degree.

This statement notwithstanding, Alison was discriminate enough to marry as her first three husbands "goode men, and riche, and olde" (D 197). Since they were both wealthy and old, Alisoun could look forward to enjoying her dower in widowhood. Having acquired her dower at the time of marriage, she no longer needed to keep up appearances and could say:

They had me yeven hir lond and hir tresoor;  
Me neded nat do lenger diligence  
To wynne hir love, or doon hem reverence, (D 204-6)

for, as we have seen, according to common law she could not be deprived of her right to dower. Indeed, if a husband sold or disposed of, in any way, any part of his wife's dower without her consent, the wife had full rights to recover the land, or its equivalent value, after her husband's death.<sup>36</sup> If the dower was constituted as *dos nominata*, the widow was entitled to the very lands that were set apart for her at the church door.<sup>37</sup>

According to English common law, a widow was entitled to retain her dower even though she remarried.<sup>38</sup> Consequently, when the Wife of Bath was making marriage overtures to Clerk Jankyn, who was to be her fifth husband, her wealth was undoubtedly an added inducement for him, for there were serious disadvantages to his marrying her. Not only was he twenty years younger than Alisoun, but by marrying a widow he deprived himself of the right to take orders in the Church.<sup>39</sup> However, Jankyn probably felt that these disadvantages would be outweighed by at least one compensation he knew he would receive — the right to control his wife's land and to receive the income from any land she brought with her at the time of marriage.<sup>40</sup> This exaggerated guardianship came to him as his right in marriage.<sup>41</sup>

As if this were not sufficient compensation, Jankyn soon received even more, because Alisoun, in a moment of generosity — or perhaps,

<sup>36</sup> Pollock and Maitland, II, 422-4; and also Glanvill, p. 93.

<sup>37</sup> Pollock and Maitland, II, 422-3; and Glanvill, p. 88.

<sup>38</sup> Pollock and Maitland, II, 419; Glanvill, p. 110.

<sup>39</sup> Esmein, II, 122; see also Eugene E. Slaughter, 'Clerk Jankyn's Motive,' *MLN*, LXV (1950), 530-4.

<sup>40</sup> Pollock and Maitland, II, 403.

<sup>41</sup> Pollock and Maitland, II, 406; Holdsworth, III, 524, 526.



weakness — stripped herself of all her wealth by conveying to him the complete ownership of her land:

This joly clerk, Jankyn, that was so hende,  
Hath wedded me with greet solempnytee ;  
And to hym yaf I al the lond and fee  
That evere was me yeven therbifoore (D 628-31)

This transfer of property could be accomplished by means of a *fine*, a deed to which both husband and wife are parties, and to which the wife has voluntarily given her consent in court.<sup>42</sup> When, in his anger, Jankyn boxed her over the ear, Alisoun could well ask "and for my land thus hastow mordred me?" (D 801), for with her death he would have become a wealthy man.<sup>43</sup>

After being so violently attacked by Jankyn, Alisoun repented of her earlier generosity and retracted her former gift. If Jankyn proved agreeable, he could have returned the land voluntarily by means of another deed. On the other hand, if he proved recalcitrant, it is difficult to conjecture by what process she retrieved her land, for little is known about a wife's legal recourse in such circumstances.<sup>44</sup> However, knowing the Wife of Bath's persuasive ways, we can be assured that no legal action was required, for Alisoun says:

But atte laste, with muchel care and wo,  
We fille acorded by us selven two.  
He yaf me al the bridel in myn hond,  
To han the governance of hous and lond,  
And of his tonge, and of his hond also. (D 811-15)

In spite of the fact that a woman existed essentially as her husband's chattel, the law did protect her to some extent. A shrewd woman, which Alisoun certainly was, could use these laws to her best advantage. By marrying rich, old men who provided her with an adequate dower Alisoun was able to be, at least for a while, generous to Jankyn. Finding her generosity repaid with blows she managed to retrieve her gift. Thus, by taking clever advantage of her legal position and of all her marital rights Alisoun was eventually able to marry, for love, a man much younger than herself, and to gain control of husband, house, and land in the bargain.

### *Urbana, Illinois*

<sup>42</sup> Holdsworth, III, 236.

<sup>43</sup> A man did have the right to chastize his wife but only within reason. For example, the Norman *Somma* does not allow a husband to put out his wife's eye nor to break her arm, for "that would not be correction." Pollock and Maitland, II, 436, n. 1.

<sup>44</sup> Holdsworth, III, 520 f.; Pollock and Maitland, II, 422-5. Also compare Carleton K. Allen's *Law in the Making* (London, 1948), 395. The Chancellor had tutelary jurisdiction in respect to those who, through special circumstances, were especially in need of protection, such as married women and children.

# The Noah Story in *Cursor Mundi* (vv. 1625-1916)

J. J. LAMBERTS

IT has been three-quarters of a century since anyone has published a critical version of any portion of *Cursor Mundi*. As part of his critical study of the *Cursor*, Heinrich Hupe printed approximately 1800 verses (EETS No. 99 OS, pp. 201\*-243\*). It was an extremely subjective effort, marred continually by notions that its author could not substantiate.

The present study constitutes an experiment in editing a Middle English literary work. Several considerations make it a rather risky enterprise. First of all, we have only a general idea of the region in which the original poem was composed. Most scholars suppose it was Durham or Northumberland, although Southern Scotland and Yorkshire have also been suggested. In the next place, we have no examples of any literary materials from any Northern dialect from *ca.* 1300 or earlier with which to compare existing materials. The oldest manuscripts representing the Northern dialect date from *ca.* 1400 and are, as a matter of fact, the ones used as a starting point here. Finally, despite certain overall similarities in the several manuscripts, the scribes have made numerous recastings in consideration of differences of time and place. No one has succeeded in working out a satisfactory account of the filiation of the manuscripts, although several have been offered.

My specific objective in this effort was to reconstruct the original poem from the existing versions. Given a literary specimen of the dialect of the original, such a reconstruction would be relatively easy. Under the circumstances, however, I can merely state that certain features of the original poem must have read thus and so. The result is a compromise, and if it resembles more closely a 15th century reading than a 14th century one, the reason ought to be apparent.

The basis of this work, the *Cursor Mundi*, was evidently extremely popular in its day as is indicated by the number of times it was recopied. Even today substantial portions of the poem survive in at least ten manuscripts. The manuscript which most closely resembled the original is Cotton MS Vespasian A iii (here indicated as V). It must be regarded as the product of two or more successive copyings of the lost original.

Of secondary importance are Fairfax MS. 14 (F), written in a Midland dialect but sharing many features with V; and Göttingen MS Theol. 107 (G) which shares with V a Northern dialect, although many words and several constructions have been changed. A fourth manuscript, MS R. 3. 8. Trinity College (T) is of occasional interest.

In preparing this edition I have realized that most surmises we may make about the phonology of the original will be sheer conjecture. Beyond a few matters which seem obvious, I have been reluctant to propose anything. In morphology, however, we are on firmer ground. If we assume that the original poem was metrically regular, we find in existing manuscripts a peculiar variety of metrical irregularities, some remedied by particles like *al*, *ful*, *wel*, etc., while others have been permitted to stand. By comparing not only manuscript with manuscript, but one verse with another in the same manuscript, we find that inflectional elements which were characteristic of the original have often been syncopated, and sometimes lost, in later manuscripts.

To my knowledge, every anthology of Middle English which includes the *Cursor Mundi* at all reproduces the "Proloug." Unfortunately, the "Proloug" is full of inconsistencies, especially in the Vespasian manuscript, the one always given. It is not until after v. 1000, more or less, that the various scribes become fairly consistent in their revisions. By and large the copyists make their changes with an almost mechanical regularity, leading at times to curious hyper-corrections. In view of such considerations the story of Noah and the Deluge (vv. 1625-1916) affords a worthy specimen for a study like this.

## Vespasian

## Critical

- 1625 Her bigins at noe þe lele                      Here begins at Noe lele  
 Þe toper werld right for to del;              Þe toper werld for to dele;  
 fiue hundret yeir had þan noe              fiue hundreth zeir þan had Noe  
 Quen he had geten his suns thre;              Quen he had geten his sunis thre;  
 Þe first was sem, cham was þe toþeir;      Þe first was Sem 7 Cham þe toþer,  
 1630 And Iaphet hight þat yonges broþer.      And Iaphet hight te zonges broþer.

1625 Metrical regularity demands *Noe lele* 'faithful Noah' rather than *Noe þe lele*. Postpositive adjectives are not uncommon in the *Cursor* (vv. 1628, 1679, 1682, etc.). Disyllabic names like *Noe* may have stress on either syllable as called for by metrical requirements. This possibility is sometimes overlooked by later copyists. G and T have *lede* 'people', an understandable mishap, but it calls for a revision of the following verse, resulting in a weak improvisation.

1626 *Þe*. In the V manuscript, and generally also in G, the voiceless and voiced interdental fricatives are consistently differentiated, the symbol *th* being used for the voiceless and *þ* for the voiced. The familiar EETS transcription by Morris occasionally ignores this differentiation (5, 33, 146, 192, 221, 234, 236, etc.). There are even occasional puns (1029) which show that the distinction must have been observed by the author. Common scribal practice, on the other hand, called for the use of *þ*, if it occurred at all, initially in pronouns and other articles and *th* elsewhere (See Otto Jespersen, *A Modern English Grammar* (Heidelberg, 1909), I, 44-5), as exemplified in F and T.

*Right*. An insertion by the V scribe or a predecessor intended to fill an imagined gap in the meter. *Werld* is one of several words often disyllabic in the language of the *Cursor* poet, but monosyllabic in later dialects, and consequently so rendered (1772).

1627 *Hundreth*. Several common words with final *th*, particularly *with*, are normally written with final *t* in V, and final *d* in G, but also with *th* in either. We may assume that *th* appeared in the original. *zeir*. The V manuscript ordinarily renders initial [j] with the letter *y*. Sometimes in words like *zee* 'ye' and *zow* 'you' it employs *z*, but this practice is far more common in the parallel manuscripts. Although F and T usually have *z* also where V and G have *gh*, as in *hight*, *sight*, *night*, the consistency in their use of *gh* indicates that the original must have had *gh* also.

1628 *Sunis*. Unstressed vowels characteristic of the dialect of the original were commonly lost in the dialects of the V and G scribes. They are commonly syncopeated in inflectional syllables.

1629 The number of instances in which *and* and *I* have been confused by the scribes shows clearly that the original manuscript employed a symbol for *and*, perhaps exclusively (1863). The juxtaposition of two stressed syllables, as *sem cham*, is untypical of the *Cursor*. A scribal 7 has been overlooked in the transcription of one of the earlier manuscripts and consequently V has inserted *was* without actually improving the sense or the meter.

1630 *Te*. Following dental consonants, *t*, *d*, *s*, as in many Middle English manuscripts, words in the *Cursor* original which ordinarily have initial *þ* consistently have initial *t* (1883). *zonges*. In the V manuscript final *t* of superlative inflections of adjectives is often lost, although Morris usually restores it in brackets. There is no reason why G should have used a substitute word here unless he failed to recognize *zonges* for what it was.

## Vespasian

## Critical

- Drightin of heuen spak til him þan,  
 And þus his resun he began:  
 "Noe," he said, "i tel to þe  
 Al þis werld bi taris me;  
 1635 Þai haf left me and mi lau,  
 O me standes þaim nan au;  
 Al his forgeten nou al þat franchises;  
 Pat i gaue man in paradis;  
 Þe erth wit sin and scham es schent  
 1640 Al rightwisnes awai es went;  
 Al lathsumnes o wikkudhede  
 Has filed þe werld on lenth and brede;  
 O þair malice mai naman speke  
 Til heuen þer of it rises þe smeke;  
 1645 Couetys, hordan, envie, and pride

Drightin of heuen spak til him þan,  
 And tus his resun he bigan:  
 "Noe," he said, "I tel to þe  
 Al þis werld bitaris me;  
 Þai haue left me 7 mi lau,  
 O me standis tam nan au;  
 Nou is forgeten al þat franchis;  
 Pat i gaue man in paradis;  
 Þe erth with sin 7 schame es schent  
 Al rightwisnes awai es went;  
 O lathsumnes 7 wikkudhede  
 Þis werld es filed on lenth 7 brede;  
 O þair malice mai naman speke  
 Til heuen þerof it rises te smeke;  
 Couetise, hordom, envi 7 pride

- 1631 *Of.* As Zygyfryd Arend ('Linking in *Cursor Mundi*,' *Transactions of the Philological Society*, 1925-30 (London, 1931), 228-35), has pointed out, we must assume an alternation of *of* before words with initial vowels or initial *h* of unstressed syllables, with *o* before words with initial consonants.
- 1634 *Bitaris.* Kaluza glosses this as a variant spelling of *betrai*. Both the NED and MED evidently take this for an erroneous spelling and they cite the G form *betrais* as 'disappoint.' *Bitaris* is the correct word, being derived from OE *tergan* 'vex, irritate, provoke, exasperate.'
- 1635 *Mi lau*, and *nan au* (1636), illustrate what Arend (222-28) refers to as "linking n" — an alternation before vowel-initial words of n-final morphemes and n-less forms elsewhere. This feature is preserved with some consistency in V as well as in the other manuscripts.
- 1637 In V the words *nou al* are arbitrarily inserted, pointing to a corruption of an earlier manuscript which the several scribes tried in various ways to amend. The V copyist or a predecessor miswrote *al* at the beginning of the verse and rather than erase he simply inserted *nou* where it would fit, regardless of what happened to the meter. The final derivational or inflectional syllable of *forgeten* and many such words with a final unstressed vowel + *d*, *l*, *n*, or *r* is syncopated before a word with an initial vowel or *h* in an unstressed syllable (1628).
- 1639 Alliteration is fairly common, but is, like internal rime, simply a stylistic device (1650, 1671, 1672, etc.).
- 1641 *Al.* This is from the preceding verse; read *O. Wikkudhede*. The unstressed vowel in V is commonly written *e*, although in many inflectional syllables, especially before *s*, an *i* seems to be preferred. The *u* spellings, though not frequent, predominate in words like *watur* (1652) or *fouul* (1690). This suggests that an initial or medial labial consonant may have been a conditioning element.
- 1642 *Filed.* G reads this as *fild*, evidently 'filled.' F phrases it as *ys full of*, following the same reasoning. We have here an aphetic form of *defiled*. The entire verse seems to have been recast as the result of a misreading in the previous verse.
- 1645 *Envi and.* Before vowel-initial words an unstressed final *i* regularly becomes consonantal; thus this would read /envyand/ (cf. 1733, 1743).

## Vespasian

## Critical

Has spred pis werld on lenth and wide;  
 Al ar þai worth-þi for to wite,  
 vnnes es ani funden quite;  
 Bot I sal do þam lij ful lau

Has spred tis werld on lenth 7 wide;  
 Al ar þai worþi for to wite,  
 Vnnes es ani funden quite;  
 Bot I sal do þam lie ful lau [prob. lien  
 [lau]

1650 Þat letes sua lightly on min au.  
 Wrak to tak i am al boun  
 I sal þam alle in watur droun,  
 Alle þaa bot þi wijf and þe,  
 Þi suns and þair wijfs thre;  
 1655 For þi leute zee sal be aght,  
 Allan i haue graunted mi sagh  
 Wit pine oxspring for i haue mint  
 Restore þe werld þat sal be tint;  
 Fra þe mast dun to þe lest

Þat letes sua lightlik on min au.  
 Wrak to taken ic am al boun  
 I sal þam al in watur droun,  
 All þaa bot ti wife 7 te,  
 Þi sunis 7 tair wiues thre;  
 For þi leute zee sal be aght.  
 Allan i graunted haue mi saght  
 With pine oxspring, for ic haue mint  
 Restore þe werld tat sal be tint;  
 Fra þe mast dun to þe lest

1648 Vnnes 'with difficulty' from OE *unēaðe* 'not easy.' The word is commonly written *vnnethes* with the genitival inflection (3422, 5277). Medial fricatives are often syncopated (cf. *heuen, rises*; 1644), and occasionally this is indicated in the spelling. The verse in V would be glossed 'Scarcely anyone is found free [of sin]'. G renders the verse *Of pine es non funden quite*, which means that he interprets *vnnes* to mean 'un-ease' or 'lack of ease,' specifically, 'pain.' T goes the next step with *woo* 'woc.'

1649 Lien. It is commonly assumed that the infinitive inflection *-en* had disappeared in pre-historic times where Northern English is concerned (Arend, 225-28; also David W. Reed, *History of Inflectional N in English Verbs before 1500* (Berkeley, 1950) 184-95). But unless we regard the *Cursor Mundi* as composed in a dialect far more southerly than is commonly suggested, we must be prepared to consider the *-en* inflection an exceedingly common, and perhaps even a regular, feature of this dialect. They are numerous in the Edinburgh manuscript (22092, 22931, 23417, etc.). It is fairly easy to conjecture where an infinitive *-en* occurred in the original from evidence in V: 64, 139, 604 (cf. 1651, 1660, 1680, 1697?, 1716, 1858, 1884).

1650 Lightlik. Arend (236-41) notes that the *Cursor* originally had what he called "linking k" in words like *I/ic* 'I', *-li/lik* '-ly' and also in the alternants *ma/ma:* 'make' and *ta/tak* 'take.'

1652 Droun is regular in V and F, but G and T recast this to *drenkil*.

1655 Aght is the crux word here. Kaluza, the NED and MED have overlooked it and Otto Strandberg (*The Rime-Vowels of Cursor Mundi* (Uppsala, 1919)) has neglected to catalog it. F simply rewords the entire verse. G, T and probably V suppose that *aght* is to be read as '8,' which is what the context rather generally suggests. G and T then rephrase the verse to avoid a difficult rime. *Aght* must be taken as a relatively rare past participle of *au* 'owe, respect, honor,' and the meaning of the passage then is 'for thy loyalty ye shall be honored.' This idea is enlarged on in the next two verses. *Sagh* in the following verse is intended to rime with *aght*, consequently we may follow Morris' amendment to *sagh*[t].

1657 Oxspring. Parallel manuscripts have *ospring*, a spelling which occurs in V only in a portion copied by the second scribe (20528). Nothing certain can be stated regarding the form in the original poem.

*Vespasian**Critical*

- 1660 Sal neþer liue ne fouul ne best.  
Bot ar i wil mi wengeaunce tak  
I will þat þou a wessel mak."  
"Sir, tel me quar of þat it sal be."  
"It sal be wroght o suare tre,  
1665 A schippe be houes þe to dight,  
Þi self sal be þe maister wright;  
I sal þe tell hou lang, hou brade,  
O quat mesur it sal be made.  
Quen þi timber es festend wele  
1670 Þou wind þe sides ilk dele;  
First bind it wele wit balk and band,  
And wind it siþen well wit wand;  
Wit pike þou lok it be noght thyn,  
Plaster it wit-oute and wit-In;  
1675 Seuen score ellen lang and ten,  
Thrys aght on wyde, on heght fiueten,  
Fiueten on heght, þat es þentent,  
Fra grund vnto þe tabulment;  
It sal be made wit stages sere,  
1680 Ilkon to serue o þair mistere;  
Þu sal bi neþen on þe side  
Mak a dor wit mesur wide,  
A windou sperand wel on hei;  
Þou lok þi werk be noght vnslei,  
1685 A hous als in to drink and etc  
And wardropp þat þou noght forget.  
Of ilkin best þou sal tak tuin  
Makes wit þe to liue þar in;  
Of ilk liuand best es wroght
- Sal neþer liuen fouul ne best.  
Bot ar þat i mi vengeance take  
I wil þat tou a vessel make."  
"Sir, tel me quarof it sal be."  
"It sal be wroght o squarid tre,  
A schip bihouis te to dight  
Þi self sal be þe master wright;  
I sal þe tellen hou lang, hou brade,  
O quat mesur it sal be made.  
Quen þi timber es festend wele  
Þou wind te sides ilka dele;  
First bind it wele with balk 7 band,  
And wind it siþen wele with wand;  
With pike þou lok it be noght thin  
Plaster it withouten 7 within  
Seuen score ellen lang 7 ten,  
Thris aght on wide, on heght fiueten,  
Fiueten on heght, tat es tentent,  
Fra grund vnto þe tabulment;  
It sal be made with stages sere,  
Ilkan to seruen o þair mistere;  
Þu sal bineþen on þe side  
Maken a dor with mesure wide,  
A windou sperand wele on hei;  
Þou loke þi werk be noght vnslei,  
A hous als in to drink 7 etc  
And wardropp þat tou noght forget.  
Of ilkin best tou sal tak tuin  
Makes with þe to liue þarin;  
Of ilka liuand best es wroght

1661 *I wil.* Clearly dittography from the next verse. G and T have *ar þat i*.

1664 *Suare.* 'square' is peculiar to V; F and T have *square*. On the other hand G has *quarid*, from OF *quarre* (MnF *carré*). The meter suggests a past participle, *squarid*. Indeed it makes more sense to suppose that this was a "squared" tree rather than the somewhat un-botanical "square" tree.

1670 *Ilka.* The meter calls for a disyllable here. There are occasional instances of *ilka* (34, 39, 761), which was evidently a regular feature of the original. F and G give it as two words: *ilk a* (cf. 1689).

1674 *Withouten*, as elsewhere in V: 102, 126, 138, 282, etc.

1677 *þentent.* Kaluza glosses this as 'the intention.' G and T read it as *þe entent* and F as *myne entent*. The objection to such readings is that they make no sense. As indicated above, an earlier *þ* is written as *t* before dentals in the original poem. Here, however, we have a hypercorrection. *Tentent*, which must have appeared in the original, was a Northern rendering of the OF present participle *tentend* < *tentir* 'extend, stretch.'

## Vespasian

## Critical

- |      |   |   |
|------|---|---|
| 1690 | Fouxul ne worme forget þou noght;<br>In þe ouermast stage þi self sal be,<br>Þe fouxules alpernest be þe;<br>Sipen efter alpernest hand<br>Þe meke beistes sal haue þair stand, | Fouul ne worme forget tou noght;<br>In þe ouermast stage þi self sal be,<br>Þe fouules alpernest be þe;<br>Sipen efter neghest hand<br>Þe meke bestis tai sal stand,  |
| 1695 | Þat es þai þat er tame and mild,<br>And vnder þam sal stand þe wild;<br>And þou sal alsua mak a boure<br>For to hald in þi wermestore;<br>In þe bopem sal be na stall,          | Þat es þaa þat er tame 7 mild,<br>And vnder þam sal stand te wild;<br>And tou sal alsua make a boure<br>For to halden þi wernestoure;<br>In þe bopem sal be na stall, |
| 1700 | For al þeir filth sal þedir fall<br>It sal be mikel wit outhen pere,<br>In making sexsith tuenti yere;<br>Sua lang terme i haue hem lent  | Bot al þair filth sal þedir fall.<br>It sal be mekil withouten pere,<br>In making sex sith tuenti zere;<br>Sua lang a terme i haue hem lent                           |

- 1690 *Fouul*. The NED notes that the various spellings with *x* are from the V manuscript and conjectures that these are "perh. miscopied from an original which had 3 (or possibly *wynn*). Either possibility raises problems, the use of *wynn* the least since this may be rewritten as *fouul*. On the other hand, there is no evidence of scribal confusion in other words. But there is confusion over 3 which appeared in the original, but apparently with no regularity. The most plausible explanation is that 3 was retained in a few words — *fouul* (or *fozul*) among them — by scrip-torial tradition.
- 1691 *þe ouermast*. Was there elision in *Cursor Mundi* or do we assume open juncture to be regular? There are actually few instances in which elision may be argued — far fewer certainly than one should imagine. It does not occur, for instance, in 1639, 1767, 1770, 1843, 1862, 1867, 1878. The construction in 1880 is ambiguous. Evidently in an emergency elision was possible (cf. 395).
- 1693 *Alpernest*. While this fits properly in 1692, it is metrically irregular here and more-over constitutes a repetition. Here as now and then elsewhere the scribe copied from the wrong verse. F and T have *next*; G *neist*. The meter calls for a disyllabic form, probably *neghest*, an archaism (cf. 103).
- 1694 *Meke*. This is to be read as two syllables, *meke* being a relic weak adjective. Weak adjectives are quite rare in the *Cursor*. Apparently here we have a petrified phrase (cf. *god[e] clerk* 1921). *þai sal stand*. This is suggested by the parallel manuscripts; *haue* in V apparently came about when the scribe began to copy *hand* from the preceding verse and then tried to amend his error.
- 1695 *Þa*. V reads this as *þai* and is thus unique. The sense of the poem is perhaps a little better served with *þa* 'those.' Here is clear evidence that /ā/ had not in 1300 coalesced with /ai/.
- 1698 *Halden þi wernestoure*. *Hald in* is an improvisation, as is certainly true of *hold unto* in G. Making an -en infinitive of this easily resolves the difficulty. *Wernistoure* in V is a miscopying of the fairly common *warnist(o)ure*.
- 1701 *It sal be*. The reference is to *þe arche*. Abrupt transitions like this one are rare in the *Cursor*. Possibly a couplet was omitted in one of the early versions.
- 1703 *Lang a term*. An instance of *a* with an adjective of measure (1733) or of quality (1759). *Hem* 'them' is a curious form, comparatively rare in V (308, 801, 1595,



*Vespasian**Critical*

- Pat wil come til amendement,  
 1705 And if þat ani wil tent to þe  
 Pat þai þar in may saued be.  
 Quen þou þi timber wel has laid  
 And it be to þi will al graid,  
 Pou and þi wijf sal first gang in,  
 1710 Ði suns wit þair wijfes thrin;  
 zee sal alsua tak zow with  
 Beist and fouxul þat sal haue grith,  
 Ðe meke be þam ai tua and tua,  
 Ðe wild do be þam self al sua;  
 1715 Of ilk kind tak tua with in  
 For to hald vp þeir auen kin;  
 Lok þou sua do for na suink  
 Pou haue default of mete and drink.  
 Do nou wel, now leue i þe  
 1720 Bot i sal eft cum þe to see;

If i see þat þou wirkes right,  
 I sal þe hald þat i þe hight."  
 Now wat sir noe quat wark to do,  
 And hent timber þat fel þar to;

- 1725 He gaf þe wrightes þar mesure  
 And wroght he self in þat labore;

Pat wil com til amendement,  
 And if þat ani wil tent to þe  
 Pat tai þarin mai saued be.  
 Quen þou þi timber wel has laid  
 And it be to þi wille graid,  
 Pou 7 ti wife sal first gang in,  
 Ði sunis with þair wiuis thrin;  
 ze sal alsua tak zow with  
 Best 7 fouul þat sal haue grith,  
 Ðe meke togeder ai tua 7 tua  
 Ðe wild do be þamself alsua;  
 Of ilka kind tak tua wiþin  
 For to halden vp þair aghen kin;  
 Lok þou sua do for na suink  
 Pou haue default o mete 7 drink.  
 Do now wel, now leue i þe [perh. Do wel  
 [Noe, now]  
 Bot i sal eft com þe to se;  
 If þat i se þou wirkes right,  
 I sal þe hald tat i þe hight."  
 Now wat Noe quat werk to do,  
 And hent te timber þat fel þarto [perh.  
 [And heud]

He gaf þe wrightes tair mesure  
 And he wroght self in þat labure;

4519, etc. — 23 in all). There are some clear Midland influences unique in V, but a careful comparison of the several manuscripts indicates that *hem* must have occurred occasionally in the original poem.

- 1708 *Wille*. The oblique case form of an older weak noun which retained an unstressed vowel as a relic inflection in the original.

- 1713 *Togeder*. That both V and G have *be þam* need not be conclusive since this is obviously copying from the next verse. *Togeder*, as in both F and T, makes a much clearer reading.

- 1716 *Aghen*. The word is disyllabic throughout, although commonly spelled *au(e)u* in V and G. The *aghen* spelling appears occasionally in V (1214).

- 1719 The repetition of *now* is not impossible, but there are confusions of the name *Noe* with similar words and one cannot rule out the highly possible reading, *Do wel Noe, now leue i þe*.

- 1724 *Hent*. This word, translated as 'took,' would suffice. F and T have *hew*, G *hend* with a note, '[or heud].' Thus we can explain the form which appears in V as derived from earlier *heud*, but with the unvoiced final stop and presently a misreading of *u* as *n*.

- 1726 *He wroght self*. Just as today we have substandard *hissel* side by side with *himself*, it is probable that the use of *self* in the late 14th century was confused by a variety of dialect mixtures. Where V has *he self* G and T have *him self*, similarly F (1758) and *his self* (1726, 1728). In these three manuscripts a fusion of the pronoun with

*Vespasian**Critical*

Pai wroght bath in wod and place  
 He self festnid bath band and lace.  
 ai to quilis pat he sa wroght  
 1730 De folk to preche for gate he noght,  
 To warne þam of our lauerds wrake,  
 And tald þam how þat he with him  
 [spake;

He tald resun til mani a man,  
 Quar for he suilk a scippe bigan;  
 1735 With hething all þai him answard  
 And said "Qui es þis carl sua ferd?"  
 Gret selcut þai said þam thocht  
 Qui he was so rad for noght,  
 And said pat man war worth be scent  
 1740 Pat tok til ald mans words tent.

Quen noe sagh his trauail tint,  
 Of his precheing þan con he stint;  
 for it es foli giue consail to  
 De folk pat wil bot foli do;  
 1745 For þi he left pat cursed lede  
 and went vnto his auen dede.

Ne less ne mare mismeid him noght  
 Bituixand he pat schippe had wroght,  
 Til it was mad and in with stadd

1750 Al þat our lauerd him forwith badd.  
 Quen he had don his commament  
 He bade noght bot þe Iugement  
 Pat drightin þan suld wirk his wil,  
 Sum he hade forwith tald him til.

1755 Þan come drightin quen he sagh tim  
 Til noe for to spek with him;

Pai wroghten bath in wod 7 place  
 He festnid self bath band 7 lace.  
 Bot te quilis tat he wroght  
 De folk to preche forgat he noght,  
 To warn þam of our lauerdis wrake,  
 And tald tam how he with him spake;

He tald resun til mani a man,  
 Quarfor he suilk a schipp bigan;  
 With hething al þai him answerd  
 And said, "Qui es tis carl sua ferd?"  
 Gret selcut, tai said, tam thocht  
 Qui he was sua radd for noght,  
 And said tat man war worth be schent  
 Pat tok til ald mans wordis tent.

Quen Noe sagh his trauail tint,  
 Of his preching þan gan he stint;  
 For foli it es giue consail to  
 De folk pat wil bot foli do;

Forþi he left tat cursed lede  
 And went vnto his aghen dede.

Ne less ne mare mismaid him noght  
 Bituixand he þat schipp had wroght,  
 Til it was made 7 inwith stadd

Al þat our lauerd him forwith badd.  
 Quen he had done his commament  
 He badd noght bot te iugement  
 Pat drightin þan suld wirk his wil,  
 Sum he had forwith tald him til.

Þan cam drightin quen he sagh tim  
 Til Noe for to speke with him;

*self* is under way, while V represents a stage much nearer to the original in which *self* appears to have been a pronominal adjective.

1727 *Þai wroghten*. The -en inflection in the preterite plural must be regarded as a semi-archaism which could be optionally employed. *Wern* (*warn*) '[they] were' (4759, 8079, 11490) appears in rimes which later scribes let stand rather than recast an entire couplet. Several other troublesome verses in this passage can be scanned satisfactorily by assuming earlier -en (1809, 1810, 1831, 1874, and possibly 1796).

1729 *Te quilis*. The considerable differences in several readings show that an earlier manuscript was unclear. *To-quilis* in V and *þe quilis* in G call for an earlier *te-quilis*, which assumes that there must have been a preceding dental; probably the *t* of *bot*, as in G.

1738 *Sa radd*. The word *radd* and also *raad* 'afraid, terrified' is common in V. It is also spelled *redd* (23024), but this is peculiar to V, parallel manuscripts having *dred*. The original had *radd* (perhaps *redd*) which G recasts as *dred*. F and T repeat *ferd* from 1736.

1743 *For foli it es*. Cf. 1645.

*Vespasian**Critical*

- Quen he his wil had with him spoken,  
 He self þe dore þan has he stoken,  
 þe windou was wit suilk a gin  
 1760 Men moght it open þat loket wit in  
 Quen al was tift was þar na bide,  
 Þe stormes ras on ilka side;  
 Sun and mone þair bemes hide,  
 Merkind oueral þis werld wide;  
 1765 Þe rain it fell sua fers and fast,  
 Þe burnes ouer þe brink it brast,  
 Þe see to ris, þe erth to riue,  
 Þe springes cum ouer all utedriue;  
 Fire slaght fell wit thoner and rain,  
 1770 Þe erth quok and dind again;  
 Sun and mone had tint þair light,  
 Þat al þis werld es turnd to night,  
 Þat sorou to see was ful gret au,  
 Þir cites fell bath hei and lau;  
 1775 Þe water wex oute ouer þe plains,  
 Þe bestes ran þan to monetains,  
 Men and wymmen als sua þer with,  
 Well went þai to þar haue grith.  
 Bot al for noght þai suanc a fote,  
 1780 Quen þai com þare was þam na bote;  
 Þe fouxuls floked þam on hei,  
 Fel don, moght þai na langer flei;
- Quen he his wil had with him spoken  
 He self þe dore þan has he stoken,  
 Þe windou was with suilk a gin  
 Men moght it open 7 lok within.  
 Quen al was tift was tar na bide,  
 Þe stormis ras on ilka side;  
 Sun 7 mone þair leme gan hide,  
 It mirked oueral þis werld wide;  
 Þe rain it fell sua fers 7 fast,  
 Þe burnis ouer þe brinkis brast,  
 Þe see to ris, te erth to riue,  
 Þe springes gan oueral vtedriue;  
 Fireslaght fell with thoner 7 rain,  
 Þe erth quok 7 dind again;  
 Sune 7 mone had tint tair light,  
 And al þis werld turnd to night,  
 Þat soru to seen was gret au,  
 Þir cites fell bath hei 7 lau;  
 Þe watur wex vte ouer þe plains,  
 Þe bestis ran to þe monetains,  
 Men 7 wimmen alsua þam with,  
 Well wenid tai to þar haue grith.  
 Bot al for noght tai suanc afote,  
 Quen þai cam þar was tam na bote;  
 Þe fouuls floked tam on hei,  
 Fel quen þai moght na langer drei;

1760 *And lok within.* The *open þat* collocation is untypical. An earlier manuscript plainly had *open 7*, which was mistaken for *open þ*. The reading of V, if taken literally, is utter nonsense.

1763 *þeir leme gan hide.* Use of the present tense form in V is clearly irregular; G on the other hand has *gan hide*. V frequently recasts an earlier *gan* or omits it (1742, 1768, 1843, 1869). *Bemes* in V stands side by side with *leme* in G. The only argument in favor of *leme* is stylistic, namely, that the *Cursor* poet is more likely to use a direct word like *leme* than a synecdochic *beme*.

1764 *It merkid.* G properly has *it merkid* in place of *merkind* of V. The participial construction is quite unusual. The manuscript of V has a mark over the final vowel much like the *n*-contraction and Morris spelled this out. The V scribe may have copied a smudge under the impression it was a letter.

1766 *Burnis... brinkis.* This is a not uncommon confusion of *s* for *t*.

1772 *And.* Whether *þat* is dittography, indeed, whether *and* provides a better reading — these depend on one's intuition. *Werld.* The reading *werld es* contradicts its context. *Werld*, as elsewhere (1626) is disyllabic.

1778 *Wenid tai.* 'thought they.' The reading in V, *went þai*, once again illustrates unvoicing of final *d*.

1782 *Fel quen þai moght na langer drei.* A series of errors has been responsible for this confusing verse. *þai* and *moght* were transposed by comparison with the construc-

*Vespasian**Critical*

- For noght þai fled ne best ne ma  
 Al to late was þai bi gan.  
 1785 Think naman selcuth þat þar suam,  
 Side and side, wolf and ram,  
 Þe leon suam beside þe hert,  
 Til oper did na beist vn quert;  
 Þe sparhawk flough be þe sterling,  
 1790 Þai tent til oper nakins thing;  
 Þe leuedis listed noght o pride,  
 Þai suam bi þar suains side;  
 O lauerdschipp was þar na strijf,  
 Was naman Ielus of his wijf;  
 1795 Was nan moght oper ne help ne suike,  
 All tok a right, bath pouer and Rike;  
 All hade a dom, bath riche and pour,  
 Was nan fra ded þat moght him couer;  
 For þar misdedes wepe þai þan,  
 1800 Alas! lait was þat þai began;  
 Þai greued þan þaa caitiues badd,  
 Þat þan hadd ben wit noe stadd.  
 Bot þof þat noe was in quert  
 He was noght al at es in hert;  
 1805 Þe wind him ledd apon þe flodd,  
 He wist noght wyder ward he 3odd;  
 Heuen and erth he flet emel,

- For noght tai fledden best 7 man,  
 Al to late was tai bigan.  
 Think naman selcuth þat tar suam,  
 Side 7 side, wolf 7 ram,  
 Þe leon suam biside te hert,  
 Til oper did na beist vnquert;  
 Þe sparhawk flogh be þe sterling,  
 Þai tent til oper nakins thing;  
 Þe lauedis listed noght o pride,  
 Þai suamen bi þair suanis side;  
 O lauerdschip was tar na strijf,  
 Was naman ielous of his wijf;  
 Was nan moght oper help ne suike,  
 All tok a right, bath pouer 7 rike;  
 All þai did droun, bath rike 7 pouer,  
 Was nan fra ded tat moght him couer;  
 For þair misdedis wepe þai þan,  
 Allas! late was tat tai bigan;  
 Þai greued tan, þa caitiues bad,  
 Þat tai had ben with Noe stad.  
 Bot tof þat Noe was in quert  
 He was noght al at es in hert;  
 Þe wind him led apon þe flode,  
 He wist noght widerward he 3ode;  
 Heuen 7 erth he flett emell

tion in the next verse. The *don* was put in place of *quen*, either to clarify the idea, or possibly by oversight. *Flei* is untypically obvious in contrast to *drei* which appears in three of the manuscripts. It seems less likely that three scribes should have selected a more precise word than that one should have struggled with an unclear manuscript and thus have produced the unimaginative *flei*.

- 1786 *Side 7 side*. This had an adverbial inflection, the first being elided with *and*; the second, however, remaining before *wolf*.  
 1792 *Suanis*. *Suain* [ON *sveinn*] is a Northern word which the other scribes replace with *knaue*. The play on the words *suamen* and *suanis* is intentional.  
 1796 *Tok*. 'Received.' In other words, all got their deserts.  
 1797 *Al þai did droun*. The reading of V is so different from the parallel versions that one must assume a confusion in an earlier manuscript. G regularly changed *droun* to *drenkil* (1652), suggesting a probable earlier *al þa di(d) droun*. The tense-bearing *did* is relatively common in the *Cursor* (1864). Misreading of *þ* for *h*, though rare, is not inconceivable.  
 1802 *Stadd*. The NED glosses this as 'beset with difficulties.' The passage suggests that the caitiffs grieved that they had been situated with Noah, or, that they were sorry not to be with Noah (now that the ark is afloat). The ambiguity lies in the word *wit*: They grieved that they had been beset with difficulties through the agency of Noah. Such an interpretation was clear to the scribe of V, but not to the scribes of the other manuscripts.

## Vespasian

## Critical

- |      |  |   |
|------|--|---|
|      | Bot he ne wist ware his schipp suld<br>[due[1];  | Bot he ne wist quar his schipp suld<br>[duell;  |
|      | Pai þat ware þar man and wijf,   | Pai þat tar waren, man 7 wijf,  |
| 1810 | Pai war ful dredand for þar lijf,<br>If he ne had þat es al o might<br>To noe forwith þair liues hight.<br>Noe wist þan wit vten wene<br>Pe folk was all fordon beden; | Pai waren dredand for þair lijf,<br>If he ne had tat es al o might<br>To Noe forwith þair liues hight.<br>Noe þan wist withuten wene<br>Pe folk was all fordon bidene;          |
| 1815 | With wipping sare on þaim he ment<br>And turnd al to godd his tent<br>He fined noþeir night ne day<br>For þat caitiue folk to prai,<br>For mans kind, sua sais þe bok, | With weping sare on þaim he ment<br>And turnid ai to godd his tent;<br>He finid noþer night ne dai<br>For þat caitiue folk to prai,<br>For manis kind, sua sais te boke,        |
| 1820 | Bot durst he neuer wel vp lok<br>He praid to godd for þam alsua<br>O þair saulus na vengeance ta;<br>Pof þan was tene in þat quile<br>O þair licam þat was sa wile,    | Bot durst he neuer with eie vp loke;<br>He praied to godd for þam alsua<br>On þair sauls na vengeance ta;<br>Pof þat was tan on þam þat quile<br>On þair licam þat was sua vile |
| 1825 | Sin þai ware ded sua reufulli,<br>Pe saulus he wald haf of merci;<br>Sua he hafd, with outen fail,<br>If þai had trouð noe consail,                                    | Sin þai war ded sua reufulli,<br>Pe sauls he wald at haue merci;<br>Sua he wald haue, withouten fail,<br>If þai had trouð Noes consail,   |

1808 *He ne wist.* *Ne* is enclitic in the *Cursor Mundi*, commonly after a pronoun with a final vowel or semi-vowel and before another vowel or semi-vowel, but also at times before consonants. In fact, spellings like *hen* 'he not' and *quin* 'why not' occur occasionally (8157, 25901). Cf. 1811.

1816 *Ai.* *Al* is plainly out of place here.

1820 *With eie.* The parallel manuscripts have *wip* (or *wid*) *eie*. *Wel* is the result of scribal haplogy.

1823 *pof þat was tan.* This entire passage is puzzling, as appears from the several manuscripts. The idea is simply that Noah prays to God not to take vengeance on the souls of the caitiff folk since He has already avenged Himself on their vile bodies. *O* in 1822 and 1824 should read *on* as the parallel versions indicate. Kaluza glosses *tene* as 'taken,' evidently by comparing other manuscripts. *Tan(e)* is fully as common in *V* as *taken* and survives, of course, in Scottish *ta'en*. There are a few *e* spellings in *V* for /ā/, as *sten* 'stone' (3836), *oletes* 'of manner' (ON *lāt-*) (3285), etc. *Pof* 'though' is rejected by the other copyists, probably because the rest of the sentence is already garbled. *Þan* was an anticipatory misreading of *tan* (*tene*), and should be read as *þat*. *On þaim* has fallen out of *V* entirely, but is preserved in *G*.

1826-7 Neither *V* nor *G* make the idea clear. Obviously Noah wanted the souls to be granted mercy since, as indicated above, the bodies had had their share of suffering. *He wald haf of merci* expresses this notion badly, if at all. *F* has translated *of merci* as partitive and renders it *sum merci*. The word order in *G* is *wild of haue*, indicating a miscopying of *at haue*, a typical infinitive construction (8376, 13156, 16371). Cf. 1916.

1828 *Noe consail.* The *V* and *G* scribes regularly employ an uninflected genitive (cf.

*Vespasian**Critical*

- 1830 Quen þai for soke his sermoning  
And toke his word al til hething  
Bot now þai find it in þair fare  
Þai wald noght lere on noe lare;  
For quils þat godd þam raght his grace,  
Littel roght þam of his manance.
- 1835 Þis rain don fell þat it ne fane;  
Bituixand fourti dais war gan  
Þe heiest fell þat was our quare  
Þe flod ouer raght seuen eln and mare;  
Pat was na creatur in liue
- 1840 Pat moght to grund or reche or riue,  
Bot it war fisse þat flett on sund;  
Was nankin best moght find þe grund.  
On þe streme þat arche can ride,  
Þe wauus best on ilk side;
- 1845 Þe stormes starked wit þe wind,  
Wath vas bifor and sua bihind;  
Noe and his loked ai don  
And' weited ai quen þai suld drun;  
Bot be zee traist, wit outen strijf,
- 1850 Inogh it lethed þam þar lijf.
- Quen þai forsoken his sermoning  
And token his word al til hething  
Bot now þai finden it tair fare  
Pat wald noght leue o Noes lare;  
For quils tat godd tam raght his grace,  
Littel roght tam of his manace.
- Þis rain don fell þat it ne fane;  
Bituixand fourti daies war gane  
Þe heiest fell þat was ouer quare  
Þe flod ouer raght seven ellen 7 mare;  
Par was na creature o liue
- Pat moght te grunde reche or riue,  
Bot it war fiss tat flett on sund;  
Was nakin best moght finden grund.  
On þe streme þe arche gan ride,  
Þe wauis beten on ilka side;
- Þe stormis starkid with þe wind,  
Wath was bfore 7 sua bihind;  
Noe 7 his sonis lokid dun  
And wenid tat tai al suld droun;  
Bot be ze traist, with outen strijf,
- Inogh it lethid tam þair lijf.

1832) in contrast to the *Cursor* original in which the inflection was preserved. The inflections were dropped by an early copyist. In this instance T has preserved the inflection but more probably restores it; F fails to recognize *Noe* for what it is intended and writes *nozt*.

1831 *Finden it*. V *find it in*; G *find it*; F *finde in*.

1832 For *þai* read *þat*. *Leue*: V *lere* 'learn'; F *liue* 'live'; G *trou* 'trust'; T *leue* 'believe,' an aphetic form.

1833 *Raght* 'reached, extended.' Side by side with *roght* 'reckoned' in the following verse this is simply a pun, but seems to involve some archaic words which the other scribes recast.

1840 *Te grunde*. Or in V appears redundant and the other scribes omit it. The only alternative which will preserve the meter is the assumption that *grunde* retains an old dative inflection.

1844 *Beten*. The next twenty lines in the V manuscript manifest so many irregularities that one can only assume that an earlier manuscript was almost hopelessly corrupt. *Best* is copied with an eye on the word two verses earlier; G has *bett* 'beat.' The preterite plural is indicated here.

1846 *Wath* was 'danger was.' G and T completely fail to recognize *wath* (ON *vāði*). The V scribe misses it on one occasion, transcribing it as *quat* (22686). F simply guesses at the context and has *grete perel*.

1847-8 Quite obviously a disyllabic word, probably *sonis*, as been lost from an early manuscript. All the existing manuscripts are defective. *Weited* 'waited' in the next verse occurs only in V and the appearance of *wend* in the other manuscripts points to *wenid* 'supposed, expected' as the likely form.



*Vespasian**Critical*

1875 "Childer," he said, "quat rede zee,  
 How sal we o þis waters weit  
 Quedir þai be fulli fallen yeit?"  
 "Thoru a fouxul," þai said, "mai we  
 Know if þe erth oght bared be,  
 For if he find þe erth oght bare  
 1880 to þe arche wil he cum namare."  
 Ðan opend noe his wyndou,  
 Lete vte a rauē, and forth he flou,  
 Flou vp and don, soght here and tare  
 A sted to sitte a pon sunquare;  
 1885 Apon þe watur welsun he fand  
 A druned beist þar lai flettand,  
 O þat flesse was he sa fain,  
 To scipp com he neuer again;  
 For þi men sais on messenger  
 1890 Ðat lengs lang to bring answare,  
 He mai be cald, with right resun,  
 An of messagers corbun.  
 Quen noe sagh and was parseueid  
 Ðat þis rauē had him deceueid,  
 1895 Lete vte a doue þat tok hir flight  
 And fand na sted quare on to light;  
 Sco com again wit outen blin  
 And noe ras and tok hur in;  
 Sīpen abade he seuen dais  
 1900 Efter þat, þe bibul sais,  
 Ðan he sent þe dofe eftsith;  
 Sco went forth and com ful suith,  
 Son sco com and duellid noght,  
 An oliue branche in moth sco broght.  
 1905 Ðan was noe wel be knauin  
 Ðat þe flode it was wit drauin,  
 Bot yeit he baid seuen dais in rest,  
 for doute if ani demmyng brest.  
 Sīpen he did þam all oute driue,

"Childer," he said, "quat reden ze  
 How sal we o þir waters wit  
 Quedir þai be fulli fallen zit?"  
 "Thoru a fouul," þai said, "mai we  
 Know if þe erth zet barid be,  
 For if he find te erth oght bare  
 to þe arche wil he cum namare.  
 Ðan opened Noe his windou,  
 Let oute a rauē 7 forth he flou.  
 Flou vp 7 down, soght here 7 tare  
 A sted to sitten apon sunquare;  
 Apon þe watur son he fand  
 A druned beist tar lai flettand,  
 O þat flesse was he sa fain,  
 To schippe com he neuer again  
 Forþi men sais o messenger  
 Ðat lengis lang to bring answare,  
 He mai be called, with right resoun,  
 An o þe messagers corboun.  
 Quen Noe sagh 7 was parseueid  
 Ðat tis rauē had him deceueid,  
 Lete oute a doue þat tok hir flight  
 And fand na sted quare-on to light;  
 Sco come again withouten blin  
 And Noe ras 7 toke hir in;  
 Sīpen abade he seuen dais  
 Efter þat te bibul sais,  
 Ðan he sent te doue eftsith;  
 Sco went forth 7 com ful suith;  
 Son sco come 7 duellid noght,  
 An oliue branch in mouth sco broght.  
 Ðan was Noe wel bi-knauin  
 Ðat te flod was nou withdrawin,  
 Bot zeit he bad seuen dais in rest,  
 For doute if ani demming brest.  
 Sīpen he gert tam al out driue,

1875 *þir waters*. *þir* (ON *peir*) 'those.' *þis* is singular.

1878-9 *Erth oght bare*. The repetition of this phrase substantially unchanged in two successive verses should occasion doubt. Except for a rearrangement of verses, it is the same in G. *Oght* (*oʒt*?) may be a misreading of earlier *zet* 'yet.'

1889 *O messagere*. V has *on*, an overcorrection. Note that the *messagere*: *answere* rime does not occur in G; in fact, the scribe recasts four verses in order to avoid it.

1895 *þat tok hir flight*. The relative pronoun seems called for although F has *ho*, G *scho*, T &.

1903 *Duellid* 'delayed' (ON *doelja*).

1909 *Gert*. The G manuscript has *gert*; the others *did*. Here we see a tendency to adopt



*Vespasian**Critical*

- |      |  |  |
|------|--|--|
| 1910 | Beist and fuxul, and man and wiue;<br>De beist thoght selcut-li god<br>Dat pai hade raght pair kindle fode.<br>vr lauerd, i wat, pam did to spede<br>Wit in peir auen kind to brede. | Best 7 fouul, man 7 wiue;<br>De bestis thoght selcutli gode<br>Dat tai had raght tair kindli fode.<br>Vr lauerd i wat tam did to spede<br>Within pair aghen kind to brede. |
| 1915 | Pan baad our lauerd to sir noe<br>At leue pe schippe wit his meyne   | Pan bade our lauerd vnto Noe<br>At leue pe schipp with his megne.  |

a more familiar word rather than a less familiar. *Gert* in G points to an earlier version.

- 1911 *Bestis*. *Beist* appears only in V where it was copied from the preceding verse. It may have been taken by error for a genitive singular by the V scribe.

*Arizona State University*

# The Sources and Meaning of Bernard Silvester's Commentary on the Aeneid

J. REGINALD O'DONNELL C. S. B.

IN spite of greatly divergent interpretations, Vergil has always enjoyed a preeminent place among the poets. At one extreme he is seen as a *pure* poet, at the other a profound teacher and philosopher.<sup>1</sup> We can, I think, set aside his fantastical reputation as necromancer and exponent of black magic.<sup>2</sup> Among these interpretations there is one which constantly recurs, namely that not only was Vergil a master of style, but also a spokesman for all things Roman. George Santyana has expressed it in elegant terms: "And Vergil, a supreme poet, sometimes unjustly belittled, shows us the same thing (the dignity and humanity of a poet's thought) in another form; his landscape is the Roman universe, his theme the sacred springs of Roman greatness in piety, constancy and law. He has not written a line in forgetfulness that he is a Roman; he loves country-life and its labours because he sees in it the origin and bulwark of civic greatness; he honours tradition because it gives perspective and momentum to the history that ensues; he invokes the gods because they are symbols of the physical and moral forces by which Rome struggled to dominion."<sup>3</sup>

Of the early commentators and admirers of Vergil two stand out as the most influential on later ages, namely Servius and Macrobius. Servius praises both the style of the *Aeneid* and its noble maxims. *Est autem stilus grandiloquus, qui constat alto sermone magnisque sententiis.*<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> T. E. Page, *The Aeneid of Virgil*, I (London, 1960) p. xii: "Virgil's object is not primarily to instruct but to please... to gratify the literary tastes of his readers and not with any practical aim;" D. L. Drew, *The Allegory of Virgil* (Oxford, 1927) p. 1: "The rubbish of years has accumulated from professor to professor;" E. Paratore, *Virgilio* (Rome, 1945) p. 90: "Vergil taught the transcendent value of Roman history;" V. Poeschl, *Die Dichtkunst Vergils* (Innsbruck, 1950) p. 77: "In some cases Servius and St. Augustine had better understanding of Vergil than most modern critics." Anniversary Vergil volume in *Studi Medievali*, N. S. 5 (1932).

<sup>2</sup> J. W. Spargo, *Virgil the Necromancer* (Cambridge, Mass., 1934).

<sup>3</sup> *Interpretations of Religion and Poetry* (New York, 1958) p. 275. Cf. also A. M. Guillemin, *Vergile, poète, artiste, penseur* (Paris, 1958).

<sup>4</sup> Preface, II (Harvard Edition, 1946) p. 4.

Vergil's purpose is *Homerum imitari et Augustum laudare a parentibus*.<sup>5</sup> It is to Macrobius, however, that we must look as the great populariser of Vergil and his works. Of the seven books of the *Saturnalia*, nearly six have to do with Vergil: *Haec est quidem Maronis gloria ut nullius laudibus crescat, nullius vituperatione minuatur*.<sup>6</sup> In Macrobius' opinion Servius outstrips all other interpreters.<sup>7</sup> Macrobius also stresses the fact that not only is Vergil a great poet, but an outstanding orator as well, even surpassing Cicero. In his works are to be found in an eminent way the four kinds of oratory, *copiosum, breve, siccum, pingue et floridum*. *Apud unum Maronem haec quattuor genera repperies*.<sup>8</sup> This theme is constantly repeated well into the Italian Renaissance. Vergil is also, according to Macrobius, an authority on Roman ritual,<sup>9</sup> and admirable as a source-book from which to teach youth.<sup>10</sup> Because Servius (*Servius noster*<sup>11</sup>) had indicated that Vergil imitated Homer, Macrobius goes into great detail in setting forth these imitations.<sup>12</sup> These discussions, in turn, became a source on Homer for later generations. Finally, Vergil is a philosopher as well as poet: *ut geminae doctrinae observationes praestiterit et poeticae figmentum et philosophiae veritatem*.<sup>13</sup>

Bernard Silvester (Sauvage or Savage) of Tours begins his commentary on the *Aeneid* with the words just quoted from Macrobius.<sup>14</sup> Bernard will attempt to portray Vergil as a philosopher, who, while not omitting the art of poetic creation, taught philosophical doctrines under the veil of allegory. Vergil becomes, of course, a Platonist or Neoplatonist, as he had been for Macrobius.

Much has been written on the history of allegorical interpretation,<sup>15</sup> but I should like to review briefly the salient points necessary to understand Bernard's method. There are, basically, three kinds of allegory: 1. theological, philosophical or physical; 2. moral; 3. grammatical. The first can be traced to the presocratics, notably Theagenes of Rhegium and Xenophanes of Colophon whose attacks on Hesiod and Homer

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>6</sup> *Sat. I*, 24, 8.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>8</sup> *Sat. V*, 1, 1-7.

<sup>9</sup> *Sat. III*, 1, 1 ff.

<sup>10</sup> *Sat. I*, 24, 5.

<sup>11</sup> *Sat. I*, 24, 8.

<sup>12</sup> *Sat. V*, 2, 1 ff.

<sup>13</sup> *Somnium Scipionis I*, 9, 8.

<sup>14</sup> G. Riedel, *Commentum Bernardi Silvestris super sex libros Eneidos Virgilii* (Greifswald, 1924) p. 1; Henceforth referred to as Riedel.

<sup>15</sup> Henri de Lubac *Exégèse médiévale*, 3 volumes, (Paris, 1959-61).

started it all.<sup>16</sup> To them the gods and their wars symbolised the elements. This tradition, furthered by the Stoics who wished to defend Homer, passed through Philo to Origen, St. Ambrose and St. Augustine, to become part and parcel of Scriptural exegesis. A second tradition, more conservative perhaps, comes down through the Platonists, again with Stoic infiltrations. In Plato *hyponoia* appears to be accepted as a normal phenomenon.<sup>17</sup> Again in the *Phaedrus*<sup>18</sup> Socrates does not really take sides with the rationalists and their interpretation of Boreas and Oreithya; their explanations are slick enough (*charienta*), but it is a full time task for Socrates to know himself. This second tradition finds its culmination in the *Homeric Questions* and *Cave of the Nymphs* of Porphyry, whom P. Courcelle calls the real master of Macrobius' thought.<sup>19</sup> In the *Cave of the Nymphs*, a commentary on book thirteen of the *Odyssey*, the ancients (*palaioi*), that is the ancient religious writers, says Porphyry, considered caves as symbols of the world both visible and invisible.<sup>20</sup> To his master's teaching Jamblichus adds a theurgic note in the *De Mysteriis Aegyptiorum*; we recall that a good deal of the *Saturnalia* is devoted to Vergil's intimate knowledge of ritualistic practices. The ps. Heracles even goes so far as to say that all the ancient myths are impious if not allegorically interpreted.<sup>21</sup> This tradition comes into the Latin Middle Ages through Macrobius, who asserts that Homer hid truths under poetic imagery, for example when he said that Zeus went off to Ocean with the other gods, that is to the planets.<sup>22</sup> This form of allegory can lead to a doctrine of Ethics and Politics as well as to a theology which transcends the visible world. Both of these traditions join hands once more in Bernard Silvester.

The moral allegory is less complicated. It, too, is closely connected with the desire to treat of the gods in a seemly way (*theoprepes*). In addition there was the moral myth, perhaps traceable to Herodotus; for when he wishes to represent the idea of an inevitable connection between guilt and punishment, he has recourse to mythical material, using a mythical aetiology to justify this ethical law.<sup>23</sup> The Latin poets

<sup>16</sup> H. Diels, *Die Fragmente d. Vorsokratiker* (Berlin, 1906) 72, 2.

<sup>17</sup> *Rep.* 378 D; cf. J. R. O'Donnell, 'Coluccio Salutati on the Poet-Teacher', *Mediaeval Studies*, XXII (1960) 240 ff.

<sup>18</sup> 229 B ff.

<sup>19</sup> *Les lettres grecques en occident* (Paris, 1943), ch. 1, Macrobc.

<sup>20</sup> Porphyrius, *Opuscula*, ed. A. Nauck (Leipzig, 1886), pp. 59 ff. cf. M. Eliade, *The Sacred and Profane* (New York, 1959) p. 59, on the centre of the world.

<sup>21</sup> *Anecdota Graeca*, ed. P. Matranga I (Rome, 1850) p. 296.

<sup>22</sup> *S. Sc.* II, 10, 11; *Iliad* I, 423.

<sup>23</sup> Mario Untersteiner, *The Sophists*, tr. K. Freeman (New York, 1953) pp. 58 ff.

give us many examples of moral allegory through personifications, metaphors and symbols; this is especially true in the satyrists.

Within grammatical allegory it is possible, I think, to distinguish two currents. First, the fabrication of myths based on paronymies of sound; for example the myth of Deucalion and Pyrrha. After the destruction of the world and all mankind by flood, the earth once more was populated by stones. Why stones? Probably because of the similarity between *laas* (stone) and *laós* (people).<sup>24</sup> The second current, and closely allied to the first, was the Stoic belief that the name and nature of a thing were somehow tied together. Origen writes: The problem is whether, as Aristotle thinks, names were given by arbitrary determination;<sup>25</sup> or, as the Stoics hold, by nature, in accordance with which they introduce certain etymological principles; or, whether as Epicurus teaches (his view not being the same as that held by the Stoics) names were given by nature, the first men having burst forth with certain sounds descriptive of the objects.<sup>26</sup> To this must also be linked the *kritikoi* of Alexandria and their efforts to find the derivations of words, although, generally, these were opposed to allegory. The Stoics were always interested in grammar because of the close alliance between dialectic, rhetoric and language.<sup>27</sup> Perhaps, too, we should note the practice made popular by St. Jerome of playing on Hebrew words and names and known through his *Libri Nominum Hebraicorum*.<sup>28</sup> Once started, this attitude to words continues on and on. Varro, Cicero, Ovid, etc. all make use of it. Isidore of Seville's *Origines* and Huguccio's *Liber Derivationum* are outstanding examples of this art. Apparently, for them words are polysemous; in fact, a word, as it were, is released with all of its associations and possible meanings to conjure up notion after notion. They were further encouraged by both Porphyry and St. Augustine, who saw in allegory an incitement to search out and discover new and more profound insights into the very nature of reality.<sup>29</sup> In addition, allegory served the good purpose of hiding truth from the vulgar.

Finally, allegory was quite consonant with the exalted concept of the poet. If the poets gave such a marvellous account of the world of

<sup>24</sup> E. Cassirer, *Language and Myth* (New York, 1946), p. 4.

<sup>25</sup> *Perh.* 16a27

<sup>26</sup> H. Chadwick, *Origen: Contra Celsum* (Cambridge, 1953) p. 23; M. Pohlenz, *Die Stoa*, II (1948) p. 24; Lucretius V, 1028; H. von Arnim, *SVF*, II, 163, p. 47.

<sup>27</sup> C. J. de Vogel, *Greek Philosophy*, III (London, 1959) p. 106.

<sup>28</sup> *Pl.* 23, 1199 ff.

<sup>29</sup> J. Pépin, 'La fonction de l'allégorie pour s. Augustin,' *Recherches Augustiniennes* I (1958) 253 ff.

reality, surely they must possess an especial knowledge, an extraordinary vision to be explored and exploited in every possible way. Plato, their master, had clearly left a legacy to be revered. The pure soul was possessed of a poetic inspiration, a kind of madness, which inspired it to write poetry. Poetry could not be learned from art; the normal person attempting to write by art alone would fade into nothingness before the singer who enjoyed this inspirational possession.<sup>30</sup> With this background Bernard takes up the task of commenting the *Aeneid*; he follows a tradition which had been in honour for well nigh fifteen hundred years and was to outlive Bernard by many more centuries.

Bernard is indebted to Servius for the external form of the commentary; for doctrine he resorts to Macrobius, Calcidius and Martianus Capella; for information he depends on the *Mythographi*, especially Fulgentius. Doubtless other sources are used, but left unmentioned, for example Hugh of St. Victor. It is always difficult to determine unnamed sources, since so many have drawn from a heritage common to all.

Bernard was well aware of the different kinds of allegory, but he uses all of them indiscriminately; for example he knew the difference between personification, symbol and metaphor; however, he is at his best, or worst, in grammatical allegory.

The commentary itself is uneven in length. Book I covers pages 1-14; book II, pp. 14-15; book III, pp. 15-23; book IV, pp. 23-25; book V, pp. 25-28; Book VI, pp. 28-115. The unevenness may be due to the influence of Fulgentius who states in *Vergiliana Continentia*:<sup>31</sup> *In secundo vero libro et tertio (Aeneid) avocatur fabulis, quibus puerilis consueta est avocari garrulitas.*

Since Bernard intends to follow the same purpose in commenting Vergil as Macrobius had done in his commentary on Cicero, fittingly enough he begins with a quotation from Macrobius to the effect that both poetic artistry and philosophical truth can be found in the *Aeneid*. There is an interesting difference. Bernard writes: *qui (Vergil) et veritatem philosophiae docuit et figmentum poeticum non praetermisit.*<sup>32</sup> Evidently Bernard is more interested in the philosophical truth. He goes on to say that if anyone wishes to teach the *Aeneid* (*legere studuerit*), he must first of all point out the intention of the author (*unde agat*), how the author carries out his intention (*qualiter agat*) and why he does it in

<sup>30</sup> *Phaedrus* 245 A; cf. P. Vicaire, *Platon critique littéraire* (Paris, 1960).

<sup>31</sup> *Fabii Planciadis Fulgentii V. C. Opera*, ed. R. Helm (Leipzig, 1898) p. 93.

<sup>32</sup> Riedel, p. 1; Macrobius, *S. Sc.* I, 9, 9.

that way (*cur agat*); yet the teacher must not forget the twofold aspect (*geminam observationem*) of the *Aeneid*.

This preface or introduction, now commonly called *accessus ad auctores*,<sup>33</sup> is a simple one, based on Servius. Actually Servius enumerates seven titles 1. life of the poet; 2. title of the work; 3. kind of poetry; 4. intention of the writer; 5. number of books; 6. order of the books; 7. exposition of the text. Bernard tells us that, although there are normally seven, he intends to use only three.<sup>34</sup> The method of the grammarians seems to be the most likely source of complicated schemes for the *accessus*.

The intention of Vergil (*unde agat*) was to unfold the story of Aeneas' hardships and those of the other Trojan exiles, not as it happened in history and as described by Dares the Phrygian<sup>35</sup>, but in order to gain the favour of Augustus. Also, Vergil, the greatest of the Latin poets wrote in imitation of Homer, the greatest of the poets of Greece; for just as Homer recounted the destruction of Troy in the *Iliad* and the exile of Ulysses in the *Odyssey*, so Vergil describes the overthrow of Troy and the vicissitudes of Aeneas. Of course, we recognize the shadow of Servius here.

Two possible orders are open to the commentator; he can follow the natural order (*narratio naturalis*) or the order of artistic creation (*narratio artificialis*); Lucan and Statius are models of the natural order; Vergil and Terence of the artistic order.<sup>36</sup> Some poets have a serious purpose, especially the satyrists; some write to please as in comedy; still others intend both to please and to instruct as do the historians. Bernard's authority for this statement is Horace: *Aut prodesse volunt aut delectare poetae // aut simul atque jucunda et idonea dicere vitae*.<sup>37</sup> This is the only indication that Bernard seems to classify Vergil as an historian as well as artist and philosopher. The pleasure found in Vergil's verse is derived from the beauty of the language and the figures of speech (*ex ornatu verborum et figura orationis*). *Figura orationis*, I suspect, has both a rhetorical and a poetic connotation. Vergil instructs the reader in two ways. First, the study and imitation of the *Aeneid* can produce a certain skill in writing, etc. Secondly, it contains a moral teaching;

<sup>33</sup> E. Quain, 'The Medieval Accessus ad Auctores', *Traditio* III (1945) 215 ff. R. Hunt, 'The Introductions to the Artes' in *Studia Mediaevalia* in honour of R. J. Martin O. P. (1948) 25 ff.

<sup>34</sup> Riedel, p. 1.

<sup>35</sup> *Daretis Phrygii de excidio Trojae historiae*, ed. F. Meister (Leipzig, 1873).

<sup>36</sup> Riedel, p. 2.

<sup>37</sup> *Ars poet.* 333.

from the recital of Aeneas' hardships can be gathered many incitements to, and examples of, virtue e.g. forbearance in trials; from his affection for Anchises and Ascanius piety (*pietas*) for which Bernard borrows a definition from Cicero: *Pietas est per quam sanguine junctis et patriae benevolum officium et diligens attribuitur cultus*.<sup>38</sup> Vergil's respect for the gods, petitions to the oracles, sacrifices, vows, prayers, etc. are all incitements to the practice of religion. Again, Bernard turns to Cicero for a definition: *Religio es quae superioris cujusdam naturae quam divinam vocant curam caerimoniamque affert*.<sup>39</sup> The *de Inventione* had considerable vogue in the Middle Ages, probably because it was codified and easy to consult. Finally, the immoderate love of Dido teaches self-control in avoiding the desire of what is unseemly. This is a somewhat different attitude from that of St. Augustine: *flebam Didonem extinctam ferroque extrema secutam*,<sup>40</sup> or Chaucer who turns rather to Ovid than Vergil for his treatment of Dido.<sup>41</sup>

The next topic to be taken up by Bernard is the proem.<sup>42</sup> The proem has a single purpose, namely to capture the good-will, docility and attention of the reader. Once again Bernard returns to his favourite accessus: *Unde agat auctor ut docilis reddatur lector, qualiter ut sil benevolus, cur attentus*. Apparently Bernard was satisfied that the intention of the writer would make the reader docile, the manner of carrying out the intention would induce benevolence and finally the reason for the manner would draw the reader's attention. The important role of rhetoric in Bernard's training is readily apparent.

The same accessus (*unde, qualiter et cur*) is to be followed in the philosophical exposition. *Unde* describes Vergil's intention to write about the nature of human life. *Qualiter* or *modus* tells, under the veil of allegory (*sub integumento*), what the human spirit performs and undergoes, placed as it is for a time (*temporaliter*) in a body. The philosophical exposition will follow the natural order; this means simply that Bernard will comment the text as it comes. The veil of allegory is thus defined: *Integumentum vero est genus demonstrationis sub fabulosa narratione, veritatis involvens intellectum; unde et involucrum dicitur*.<sup>43</sup> In the process of removing the veil the reader comes to know

<sup>38</sup> Riedel, p. 38; Cicero, *de Inventione* II, 22, 65; cf. also PL 171, 1022 C.

<sup>39</sup> Riedel, p. 40; *de inv.* II, 53, 161.

<sup>40</sup> *Conf.* I, 13, 21.

<sup>41</sup> E. F. Shannon, *Chaucer and the Roman Poets* (Cambridge, Mass., 1929) p. 57.

<sup>42</sup> Riedel, p. 3; *de Inv.* I, 16.

<sup>43</sup> Riedel, p. 3.



himself; self-knowledge is a gift of heaven: *de celo descendit notisheliton*.<sup>44</sup>

The commentary on book I opens with a brief and jerkily written argumentum. Juno comes to Aeolus and gives Deiopeia to him. Aeneas is storm-tossed but escapes with seven ships. Next he comes to Carthage under the protection of a cloud, which Venus later removes. Although his companions are in sight, Vergil does not speak to them. Aeneas is then dined and treated to the music of Joppas. Dido receives Cupid disguised as Ascanius. (Bernard does not use the name Julius). Fulgentius is the source for the argumentum; for example from Fulgentius: *Nam et cum septem navibus evadit*.<sup>45</sup> Bernard writes: *Evadit cum septem navibus*.<sup>46</sup>

The argumentum concludes with the words: *Haec omnia quae in prima aetate contingunt in primo volumine narrantur*.<sup>47</sup> The division of the books of the *Aeneid* according to the different ages of man is based on the allegory of Fulgentius, namely that Aeneas symbolises the soul in its pilgrimage through life.<sup>48</sup> Book I covers the period of infancy; book II, boyhood; book III, adolescence; book IV, youth; book V, manhood; book VI, death and descent to the lower regions.

Bernard begins the exposition proper with the genealogy of Juno, so important a figure in the *Aeneid*.<sup>49</sup> Four of the children of Saturn and Opis escaped being devoured; these were Jupiter, chief amongst the gods, (*deus aliorum*), Juno, his sister and wife, goddess of childbirth, Neptune, god of the waters (*deus aquarum*), and Pluto, god of the lower regions. Here is how Bernard allegorises the myth: Saturn is time; Opis is matter; the children have been begotten of matter in time; Saturn devoured all of his children except the four elements, namely Jupiter, Juno, Neptune and Pluto. By devious means Jupiter becomes fire, Juno air, Neptune water and Pluto earth. Jupiter is god of everything on earth because he is *ignis superior* or the sun. The source of this is Macrobius,<sup>50</sup> who in turn borrowed the doctrine from Porphyry's treatise on the sun.<sup>51</sup> In fact, Macrobius reduces all the deities to the

<sup>44</sup> Juvenal, xi, 27; Macrobius, *S. Sc.* I, 6, 6; I, 9, 1.

<sup>45</sup> *Virg. cont.* pp. 90-1.

<sup>46</sup> Riedel, p. 4.

<sup>47</sup> Riedel, p. 3; *Verg. cont.* passim; *Fabii Claudii Gordiani Fulgentii V. C. de aetatibus mundi et hominis*, ed. R. Helm, pp. 129 ff.

<sup>48</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>49</sup> Fulgentius, *Mit. fabulis* 2-3, pp. 17 ff.

<sup>50</sup> *Sat.* I, 17-23; M. Schedler, 'Die Philosophie des Macrobius,' *Beiträge zur Geschichte d. Philosophie d. Mittelalters*, XII, heft 1 (Muenster, 1916) 98.

<sup>51</sup> Schedler, *ibid.*

sun and its worship.<sup>52</sup> Neptune is the *deus aquarum*, since all water comes from the sea where Neptune holds sway. Neptune, therefore, is water. Pluto is earth, because in the regions of death (*in regione caducorum*) the weight of the earth is dominant. Finally, Juno is air. ἀήρ is an anagram of ἥρα; this anagram can be traced back to Zeno.<sup>53</sup> Juno is formed from the same matter as air. She is wife to Jupiter because she receives *calor* from him and is subject to him. Bernard does not discuss this important Stoic notion of the *vis caloris* in the commentary, but mentions it briefly in the *De Universitate Mundi*:<sup>54</sup> *Ignis namque aethereus sociabilis et maritus gremio telluris conjugis affusus generationem verum publicam, quam de calore suo producit ad vitam, eam inferioribus elementis commodat nutriendam*. Juno is also the goddess of childbirth and therefore associated with Lucina; Juno means *juvans novos*; Lucina *lucem nautis praebens*; doubtless *nautis* should be *nascentibus*.<sup>55</sup>

Next to be reviewed is Aeolus, that is *quasi eōn holoos, id est saeculi interitus*.<sup>56</sup> The etymology is apt, says Bernard, because at birth the life of the soul perishes when it descends from its divinity to be oppressed by the weight of the flesh and to give way to its lusts. More than once Bernard asserts this emphatic Platonic and Neoplatonic tenet; for example, in fabricating the etymology of Aeneas as *ennos* and *demas*, that is *habitor corporis*; *demas* (body) also means bond (*dema*); the body, therefore, can be said to be the prison of the soul.<sup>57</sup> This etymology was, it would appear, based on a false syllabification of *ennosigaeum*, a word found in Juvenal.<sup>58</sup> Probably *ennos* was associated with *ennaiō*. Most of this discussion is little more than a variation on a theme by Macrobius.<sup>59</sup>

Deiopeia, Juno's most beautiful handmaiden, was given as spouse to Aeolus. Since Juno is air, her attendants symbolise the effects of air, that is the diverse kinds of storms. This is the occasion for Bernard to introduce a long discussion on storms, rain, fog, typhoons, comets, etc.

<sup>52</sup> *Sat.* I, 17-23.

<sup>53</sup> von Arnim, *SVF*, index s.v.

<sup>54</sup> F. Solmsen, 'Cleanthes or Posidonius? The Basis of Stoic Physics', *Mededelingen d. Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen afd. Letterkunde*, XXIV, 9 (1961) 265 ff. *De Universitate Mundi*, ed. S. Barach & J. Wrobel (Innsbruck, 1876) p. 29.

<sup>55</sup> Huguccio, *Liber derivationum*, s.v. *luceo*, MS Cambridge, Gonville & Caius 459/718 fol. 29<sup>rb</sup>.

<sup>56</sup> Fulgentius, p. 91.

<sup>57</sup> Riedel, pp. 10 & 30; Macrobius *S. Sc.* I, 11, 3.

<sup>58</sup> Juvenal X, 182.

<sup>59</sup> *S. Sc.* I, 10 ff.

He also states that the stars affect births to such an extent that a stamp is placed upon the newly-born which endures throughout his whole life; this effect not only touches the physical life, but the moral as well.<sup>60</sup>

These are a few examples of Bernard's method of philosophical allegory. Based on Macrobius and Fulgentius, it has grown a good deal from its rather conservative beginnings in the Presocratics. However Bernard feels that allegory is necessary; he realizes very well that there must be equivocations (*aequivocationes*) and polyvalence (*multivocationes*),<sup>61</sup> otherwise the truth cannot stand. In other words Vergil's works are mere fable unless they permit of allegory. Any notion of *pure* poetry, in a nineteenth century sense, is quite foreign to Bernard's way of thinking.

After the destruction of Troy Aeneas, an exile, sets out to found a new city.<sup>62</sup> The city is the human body in which the spirit (Aeneas) dwells and rules. Just as in the city there are four divisions (*mansiones*), so also in the human body there are four divisions or sections. It is the Platonic division of gold, silver and iron but with an addition, namely the *cuppedinari*, a term borrowed from Terence and Apuleius,<sup>63</sup> and applied in general, I think, by Bernard to shopkeepers. *Mansio* is a term borrowed from astronomy and applied to the divisions of society. Bernard also uses it in the *Experimentarius*.<sup>64</sup>

The first *mansio* is the citadel (*arx*) in which the wise men dwell; the *arx corporis* is the head in which are to be found wisdom, the powers of sensation, and the three cells of *ingenium*, *ratio*, and *memoria*. The second *mansio* is that of the soldiery, which corresponds to the heart wherein dwells courage (*mansio animositatis*). The third *mansio* is that of the *cuppedinari* to which correspond the reins, the seat of cupidity and avarice. The play on *cupido* and *cupedo* is evident. The fourth is the *suburbium* (*sedes agricolarum*); these are the hands and the feet.

This organic view of society certainly was hinted at in the *Republic* of Plato,<sup>65</sup> but is usually traced to John of Salisbury's *Policraticus*, written in 1159 and some years after Bernard's commentary. Webb gives a brief note to Abelard.<sup>66</sup> I should like to suggest Apuleius as the most

<sup>60</sup> Riedel, p. 5; cf. *Experimentarius* in *Rivista critica di storia della filosofia*, 14, fasc. 3 (1959) 307 ff.

<sup>61</sup> Riedel, p. 9.

<sup>62</sup> *Aen.* III, 11-1.

<sup>63</sup> Apuleius, *de Magia*, ch. 29; Terence, *Eun.* II, 2, 25.

<sup>64</sup> *Vg.* p. 323, l. 21.

<sup>65</sup> *Rep.* 334-341; cf. also E. Barker, *The Political Thought of Plato and Aristotle* (London, 1906) pp. 92, 112, 198.

<sup>66</sup> *On Pol.* V, 2: Otto Gierke, *Political Theories of the Middle Ages*, tr. by F.W. Maitland, (Cambridge, 1927), p. 106, n. 10.

probable source for Bernard. In the *de Dogmate Platonis* Apuleius writes: *Quare idem bene pronuntiat, hominis animam esse corporis dominam. At enim tres partes animae ducat esse: rationabilem id est mentis optimam portionem, hanc, ait, capitis arcem tenere... cupidinem atque appetitus, postremam mentis portionem infernas abdominis sedes tenere, ut popinas quasdam, etc.*<sup>67</sup> The substitution of *popina* for *cuppedinarius* does not seem to be a very violent one; once this is made the parallel is, I think, rather exact. The rise of the merchants in the twelfth century makes Bernard's division understandable. This organic view of society becomes quite important in the fourteenth century, when the fisc supplants the merchants.<sup>68</sup>

The head is the seat of wisdom (*in medio cerebri*) in whose service are *ingenium*, *ratio*, *memoria* and the senses. Wisdom is symbolised by Apollo: *Latona, mater Apollinis, est doctrina a qua procedit sapientia.*<sup>69</sup> Wisdom flows from learning and incites the wise man to turn to things divine and not to waste time on recondite affairs (*arcana*). Wisdom is conceived in a very Ciceronian manner by Bernard. The wise man knows what he should strive for, what he should avoid and why.<sup>70</sup> *Ingenium* is a means to discovery: *est instrumentum inveniendi*; reason is a power of judgment: *est instrumentum discernendi inventa*; memory is the power of preserving knowledge: *est instrumentum conservandi inventa*. Again we note the Ciceronian colouring of Bernard's ideas. There are many more discussions in the first five books, but they follow, more or less, the same pattern.

Book six of the *Aeneid* describes the descent of Aeneas to the lower regions. This, says Bernard, contains philosophical truth.<sup>71</sup> Before philosophy had reached maturity, the theologians (*professores theologiae*) held that the nether regions symbolised human bodies. Surely there is nothing beneath these bodies. This, of course, is taken from Macrobius.<sup>72</sup> Elephants are larger, bulls stronger, tigers swifter. Trees also are superior; for if we cut a branch from a tree, it will grow green again; not so with human bodies. Inanimate things, too, are less fragile than the human body. Therefore it is quite reasonable to call the body *infernum*. This last is borrowed from Boethius.<sup>73</sup>

<sup>67</sup> I, 13.

<sup>68</sup> W. Ullmann, *The Medieval Idea of Law as represented by Lucas of Penna* (London, 1946) pp. 163 ff.

<sup>69</sup> Riedel, p. 110.

<sup>70</sup> Riedel, pp. 84 & 51.

<sup>71</sup> Riedel, pp. 27-8.

<sup>72</sup> *S. Sc.* I, 10, 9-17.

<sup>73</sup> *Cons.* III, 8, 6.

There are according to Bernard really four descents into hell: 1. Natural, at birth when the soul enters a body, its earthly prison; 2. By virtue, when man turns to earthly things to study them in order to be drawn to heavenly things and praise for the Creator; 3. By vice, when man turns to earthly things to find complete satisfaction and happiness in them; 4. By black-magic, not necromancy, when man petitions the demons to tell about the future life: (*artificium nigromanticum*). *Per aliquid execrabile sacrificium demonum petit colloquium eosque de futura consulit vita.*<sup>74</sup> Bernard says that he is interested only in the second and the fourth of these. Perhaps, we might limit ourselves to the second, from which Bernard *secundum integumentum figuram* constructs a formulary of the seven liberal arts and at the same time some norms of human conduct; for the latter there was no other specifically arranged programme.<sup>75</sup>

When man turns to earthly things to see and study their frailty and greatness, if he is wise, he will return to God and appreciate and understand Him all the better; so also the seven liberal arts are a necessary preparation for the study of Scripture, from which we come to a knowledge and understanding of God.

Seneca, an important figure in the twelfth century, has seen in the liberal arts merely a preparation for wisdom: *Non discere debemus ista (liberalia studia), sed didicisse.*<sup>76</sup> The theologian, too, had always looked upon the arts as propaedeutic to Theology, and the study of Scripture, the written source of theological wisdom.

To begin his discussion Bernard uses the occasion of the coming of Aeneas' fleet *Triviae lucos atque aurea tecta.*<sup>77</sup> *Trivia* conjures up the word *trivium*, the study of eloquence through rhetoric, dialectic and grammar. For many centuries the arts had not been so sharply distinguished into trivium and quadrivium or quadrivium. Boethius had introduced quadrivium to cover the mathematical disciplines of arithmetic, geometry, music and astronomy,<sup>78</sup> but trivium came in much later. One of the earliest uses seems to be in scholia on the *Ars poetica* of Horace.<sup>79</sup> Unfortunately the manuscript is not dated (10-11th cent.?). The text contains many insular characteristics, especially in the

<sup>74</sup> Riedel, p. 30.

<sup>75</sup> Ph. Delhayé, 'Ética et Grammatica', *RTAM*, 25 (1958) 59 ff.

<sup>76</sup> *Ep.* 88, 2.

<sup>77</sup> *Aen.* VI, 13; Fulgentius, pp. 95 ff.

<sup>78</sup> *Arith.* I, 2, PL 63, 1079 D.

<sup>79</sup> *Ars poet.* 306; cf. Pio Rajna, 'Le denominazioni trivium e quadrivium', *Studi Medievali* N. S. I (1928) 4 ff.

abbreviations. It also has a miniature of the seven liberal arts; the trivium (rhetoric, dialectic and grammar) is represented as leading to Ethics and the cardinal virtues; the quadrivium (Vergil's *aurea tecta*) leads to Physics. The trivium is primarily aimed at the *studium eloquentiae*; *studium est vehemens et assidua animi applicatio ad aliquid agendum cum summa voluntate*.<sup>80</sup> This definition is almost verbatim from the *de Inventione*.<sup>81</sup> *Eloquentia est scientia formans suum lectorem ad congruam cognitorum prolationem*, that is the knowledge necessary to express fittingly what one knows. Here, eloquence is reduced to a formalistic definition, more in the spirit of St. Augustine, who defined eloquence as the art of expressing fittingly what we think (*quae sentimus*).<sup>82</sup> A Christian could not equate wisdom and eloquence as Cicero had done, for whom *eloquentia* was a *copiose loquens sapientia*; the *custos omnium virtutum*.<sup>83</sup> Bernard continues: To express oneself fittingly requires a knowledge of grammar, especially to learn how to avoid solecisms and barbarisms. Also, in speaking one must be able to discern truth from falsity and to prove and disprove; this is the purpose of dialectic. Finally, a speech may be very elegant and logical but fail to convince the hearers; the orator must persuade; this is the role of rhetoric, or eloquence. Hence *grammatica est initium eloquentiae, dialectica dicitur provectus, rhetorica perfectio*. Although some authors have insisted that this order should not be over-emphasized,<sup>84</sup> still the very fact that rhetoric is the completion or perfection of eloquence seems to me to be significant. Eloquence is on a lower level than philosophy: *Clarior est eloquentia poesi, clarissima philosophia*. On this point Bernard decisively parts company with Cicero.

At the point of the narrative where Aeneas seeks the lofty heights and the vast cavern of the Sybil,<sup>85</sup> Bernard introduces a classification of knowledge and the arts. *Sybilla* stands for *scibile* (probably a play on the pronuntiation of the two words); *scibile* is the *divinum consilium*; *consilium* is the *intellegentia*. It is through the intelligence that man takes his counsel: *per eam homo sibi consulit*; the intelligence is divine because through it man comes to an understanding of things divine.<sup>86</sup> *Intellegentia* is distinguished from *scientia*; *scientia*, the sum-total of knowable things, is divided into four parts: 1. wisdom; 2. eloquence; 3. mechanics;

<sup>80</sup> Riedel, p. 31.

<sup>81</sup> I, 25, 36.

<sup>82</sup> *Contra Cresc.* I, 1, 2, PL 43, 447.

<sup>83</sup> *de Part. Oral.* ch. 23.

<sup>84</sup> R. McKeon, 'Rhetoric in the Middle Ages', *Speculum*, 7 (1942) 23, n. 2.

<sup>85</sup> *Aen.* VI, 9-10.

<sup>86</sup> Riedel, p. 31.

4. *poesis*. Here Bernard subdivides *mechanica* into textiles, architecture, navigation, hunting, farming, theatre and medicine. With the exception of *architectura* this is exactly the division of Hugh of St. Victor who has *armatura* for *architectura*, a division of *armatura*.<sup>87</sup> Although Bernard borrows from Hugh of St. Victor, nonetheless the total arrangement of the arts is quite different. For Hugh, under the general heading of philosophy, are the four divisions of Logic, Ethics, Speculative (*theorica*) disciplines and mechanics. These are again subdivided. Under Logic there are thirty three titles among which are grammar, rhetoric, metrics, *prosa*, history and dialectic. Under Ethics there are three, namely solitary, private and public. Under *Theorica* are Mathematics, Physics and Theology. Under Mechanics, the seven just mentioned.<sup>88</sup> It is readily apparent that the schema of Bernard is much more Ciceronian in character. In the *de Officiis*<sup>89</sup> Cicero distinguishes between the *artes liberales* and *illiberales*. Fishmongers, poulterers, butchers, etc. along with architecture, medicine and merchandising (*mercatura*), unless a big business, are all illiberal. Between Cicero and Bernard there is one notable difference. Cicero gave a high place to agriculture (*nihil libero dignius*). Apparently farming had gone down in the scale. Both Hugh of St. Victor and Bernard called the *artes mechanicae artes adulterinae*; possibly *mēchanikē* and *moicheia* were enough alike to be the subject of a play on words.

Above all of the arts is Theology or *Sacra Pagina*.<sup>90</sup> This introduces a further classification of knowledge into *theorica* and *practica*. The theoretic has to do with incorporeal things, practical with human activities or the mechanical arts. Theology, in first place, deals with the Creator, His Wisdom, the angels, soul of the world et cetera. In second place within the theoretic is mathematics, and in third place philosophy. The distinction between theoretic and practical, made by both Hugh of St. Victor and Bernard, does not seem to correspond to that of Aristotle, but rather to that of Chaucer's cursed monk, Constantinus Afer, who divides medicine into *theorica* and *practica*; theoretical medicine contains Physics etc., i.e. the whole background necessary to practice medicine; practical medicine is the actual curing of the patient.<sup>91</sup>

<sup>87</sup> *Diáscalicon*, I, 20, ed. C. H. Buttimer, (Washington, 1939) p. 38.

<sup>88</sup> Jean Leclercq, 'Le de grammatica de Hugues de S. Victor,' *ADHL* 14 (1943-5) 263 ff.

<sup>89</sup> I, 42.

<sup>90</sup> Riedel, p. 43.

<sup>91</sup> *Liber Pantegni (pantechni)* Ysaac Israelite filii Salamonis Regis Arabiae quem Constantinus Aphricanus Monachus Montis Cassinensis sibi Vendicavit (Lyons, 1515). Cf. article by M. Bassan in the present number of *Mediaeval Studies*.

To the cave of the Sybil there are a hundred entrances;<sup>92</sup> these symbolise the teachings of the Stoics, Platonists and Pythagoreans, in other words the philosophies which Macrobius mentions most frequently.

In spite of all the divisions just made, Bernard insists that all learning begins with the *auctores*, that is the poets: *Sunt namque poetae ad philosophiam introductorii*.<sup>93</sup> Daedalus built a mighty temple to Phoebus;<sup>94</sup> this temple represents the speculative and philosophical sciences; the portals to the temple are the *artes* and the *auctores*. On the portals the death of Androgeos is depicted, which symbolises ALL the fables of the poets; these are not to be interpreted allegorically. This statement seems to make no sense unless read in the context of its source, Macrobius,<sup>95</sup> who states that only those fables with some foundation are to allegorized; those which are unseemly or trivial are rightfully rejected. Bernard writes: *hae fabulae figurant OMNES poetarum fabulas*.<sup>96</sup>

There are only two references to *imitatio*. In discussing the Gorgons and Harpies the name of Hercules naturally suggests itself; mention of Hercules brings up the names of Zetes and Calaias;<sup>97</sup> Zetes is akin to *zelus*; *zelus* means *aemulatio*. *Poesis tota est in imitatione*, that is in the pursuit of glory by surpassing those whom we imitate. Quintilian had written: *Turpe etiam illud est, contentum esse id consequi quod imiteris*.<sup>98</sup>

Cleverness is due to a right mixture of the elements. *Ingenium* is owed to heat; memory to cold. The best proportion of heat and cold is in manhood; in youth there is too much heat, in old age too much cold.<sup>99</sup> This again is from Constantinus Afer.

Reason and virtue must go together: *ratio sine virtute otiosa est, et virtus sine ratione ideota est*.<sup>1</sup> This is so because at one time or other man faces a choice, a *bivium*, the Pythagorean letter: on *gemina super arbore sidunt*.<sup>2</sup> In old age the vices are constrained by the predominance of cold;<sup>3</sup> that is why old men speak first, *quia in senibus est rerum prudentia et rerum memoria: on sic prior adgreditur*.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>92</sup> *Aen.* VI, 43.

<sup>93</sup> Riedel, p. 36.

<sup>94</sup> *Aen.* VI, 19.

<sup>95</sup> *S. Sc.* I, 2, 7-12.

<sup>96</sup> Riedel, p. 37.

<sup>97</sup> Hyginus, *Mit. fab.* 13.

<sup>98</sup> Riedel, pp. 2 & 70; Quintilian, *Inst. Orat.* X, ch. 2.

<sup>99</sup> Riedel, p. 48.

<sup>1</sup> Riedel, p. 64.

<sup>2</sup> *Aen.* VI, 203; Persius, III, 56; St. Jerome, *Ep.* 107, 6.

<sup>3</sup> Riedel, p. 48.

<sup>4</sup> *Aen.* VI, 387.



Gluttony and the other vices interfere with progress in knowledge. Asceticism is necessary. Too much food and drink send thick fumes to the brain cells and retard their function. Somehow the vices of gluttony, drunkenness and lechery are allied: *Sine Cerere, et Baccho friget Venus*.<sup>5</sup> This text is quoted from Fulgentius.<sup>6</sup> Ceres and Bacchus are forces in nature: *potentia naturalis terrae*.<sup>7</sup> The source for the harm done by gluttony, etc. is Constantinus Afer; for example he says that one should not get drunk more than once a month, twice at most.<sup>8</sup>

There are many other problems which Bernard treats briefly, for example there is one text which seems to contradict his previous position, namely that *intellegentia* has its seat in the breast: *pectus cui inest intellegentia*;<sup>9</sup> I can only suggest that perhaps the intelligence has control over the lower faculties: *Ducit enim quo vult spiritus membra corporis*.<sup>10</sup> Also the golden bough, philosophy, would be worth noting, or again the *anima mundi*.<sup>11</sup>

The commentary of Bernard has covered a good deal of ground, Physics, Ethics, Education, etc. It is a sort of encyclopaedia compiled to serve the needs of his times and modelled upon the encyclopaedias of the fourth and fifth centuries. In the fifth century great changes were afoot; the barbarians were invading Hippo as St. Augustine lay on his deathbed. The encyclopaedists were attempting to save the past and put it at the service of a new era. Bernard Silvester, following their lead, attempts to put classical letters to work for his own day. There can be no doubt about the exaggerations of Bernard's method. John of Salisbury saw fit to protest against it: *At in liberalibus disciplinis, ubi non res, sed dumtaxat verba significant, quisquis pro sensu litterae contentus non est, aberrare mihi videtur, aut ab intelligentia veritatis, quo diutius teneantur, se velle suos abducere auditores*.<sup>12</sup>

In spite of modern judgments it was just such men who kept Vergil alive; it was an encouragement to collect and study the manuscripts of that great poet. Certainly, Graeco-roman culture, thus understood, is not what it was in itself, but what it represents to someone of another

<sup>5</sup> Terence, *Eun.* 732.

<sup>6</sup> Fulgentius, *Mit.* p. 40.

<sup>7</sup> Riedel, p. 47; cf. also p. 59: *Ceres quasi creans res*.

<sup>8</sup> Folio 59va.

<sup>9</sup> Riedel, p. 43.

<sup>10</sup> Riedel, p. 13.

<sup>11</sup> Tullio Gregory, *Anima Mundi, la filosofia di Guglielmo di Conches e la scuola di Chartres* (Florence, 1955); for the Golden Bough see Fulgentius, p. 97.

<sup>12</sup> *Pol.* VII 12 ca. finem.

time and culture, using his own symbols and supplying for his own needs. Without this fact any philosophy of culture must remain merely antiquarian, a morphological and historical study without meaning for the human condition as such.<sup>13</sup> *Omnia non pariter rerum sunt omnibus apta.*<sup>14</sup>

Finally, allegory was a sort of truce between monotheism and polytheism. The twelfth century scholar was a good enough judge of latinity to appreciate the charm of the pagan poets; he needed, however, some excuse to take them seriously; allegory offered him a way out of the dilemma. Besides, philosophy was gradually gaining ground over the old humanist education; rhetoric and grammar were steadily being pushed into a servant's role. The type of commentary which has just been reviewed, far from being a mere school exercise, as some authors assert, was rather an attempt to join together *nova et vetera*.

*Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies*

<sup>13</sup> M. Eliade, *Images and Symbols* (London, 1952) p. 174; by the same author *The Sacred and the Profane* (New York, 1959) pp. 221 ff.

<sup>14</sup> Propertius III, 9, 7.

# Sixteen Sayings by Richard of Campsall on Contingency and Foreknowledge

EDWARD A. SYNAN

A SERIES of pronouncements by Richard of Campsall on the divine foreknowledge of future contingents is included in the 1496 Bologna edition of Ockham's *Expositio aurea* under the title: *XVI dicta Ricard. de capsali*.<sup>1</sup> With minor variations, these sixteen *Sayings* are preserved in a 14th century British Museum codex as the: *Notabilia quedam Magistri Richardi camassale pro materia de contingentia et prescientia dei*.<sup>2</sup>

## I

In the printed edition, Campsall's theses are located in a doctrinal context for they are the last item introduced by the editor to elucidate problems raised by the ninth chapter of Aristotle's *Peri hermeneias*. Their context in the manuscript, on the other hand, is wholly accidental: three scribes have taken advantage of some blank folios between two major works to write in three unrelated short pieces: the sixteen *Sayings*, a listing of the opinions of Peter Lombard not generally conceded by later theologians, and a *Quaestio* on whether meritorious works increase the habit of charity.

<sup>1</sup> *Expositio aurea et admodum utilis super Artem veterem edita per venerabilem inceptorem fratrem Guilielmum de Occham cum questionibus Alberti parvi de Saxonia* (Bononiae, 1496); Campsall's name occurs consistently as *de capsali* (fols. 113<sup>r</sup> b, 113<sup>v</sup> b, 135<sup>v</sup> b) and it is under this form of his name that the *XVI dicta* are identified in C. Prantl, *Geschichte der Logik im Abendlande* (Leipzig, 1927 repr.) IV, pp. 97, 98.

<sup>2</sup> Already listed in the *Catalogue of Harleian Manuscripts in the British Museum* (London, 1808) III, p. 11, this text, No. 3243, contains the Campsall piece on fol. 88<sup>r</sup> a, b, written in a clear, fourteenth century hand, moderately abbreviated; a few slips have been corrected by the scribe who wrote the text, the marginalia are limited to marginal numbers and to the expression *nota bene* at the end of *dictum* no. 9; J. A. Weisheipl, O. P. kindly brought this manuscript to my attention.

Benedictus Hectoris (Faelli), a Bolognese master-printer,<sup>3</sup> is responsible for the material production of the 1496 edition of the *Expositio aurea*. After Ockham, the most important contributor to this collection is Albert the Little of Saxony. Frequent editorial interpolations, each enclosed between the initials F and M, are the work of a Celestine Benedictine, Frater Marcus de Benevento,<sup>4</sup> to whom the colophon ascribes the correction and organization of the volume. The colophon is generous with doctrinal, not to say doctrinaire, characterizations: William of Ockham is "the venerable inceptor", "the more than subtle doctor", "the most celebrated master of theological truths and a most acute master of logical ones", "prince of the sacred school of the unvanquished nominalists." Ockham's comments on the *ars vetus* are reinforced by "the extremely profound questions of Albert the Little of Saxony, a student of that same school" and the editor, Brother Mark, is identified as "a most devoted member of the same academy."<sup>5</sup> If we can trust a dedicatory epistle in which a Joannes Batista Millanus dedicated the edition to a Joannes Trachsel, addressed as "an ornament of the nominalists' academy," Brother Mark should be credited with having raised to the skies the formerly despised doctrine of the nominalists.<sup>6</sup> The brief work of Campsall has not merited him a mention in this colophon, but the impression is inescapable that Mark of Benevento must have considered Richard of Campsall a nominalist if not an Ockhamist.<sup>7</sup> Philotheus Boehner, the modern editor of Ockham's

<sup>3</sup> This printer and bookseller is known to have been active in Bologna from 1487 until 1523, in partnership with Plato de Benedictis until 1491; v. *Lexikon des gesamten Buchwesens* (Leipzig, 1936), II, p. 71 and C. F. Bühler, *The University and the Press in Fifteenth Century Bologna* (Texts and Studies in the History of Mediaeval Education, No. VII, The Mediaeval Institute of Notre Dame, 1958) pp. 89-93.

<sup>4</sup> The 1496 edition of Ockham's *Expositio aurea* is not the only intervention of Mark of Benevento in the promotion of Ockhamist studies; he is, for example, the editor of the 1522 Venice edition of the *Summa totius logicae* and is credited by the colophon of that edition (fol. 81<sup>v</sup> b) with having: etate nostra veram Nominalium achademiam in Italia suscitavit; on the 9 April 1498, Mark became a Master in Theology in the University of Bologna, v. *Universitatis Bononiensis Monumenta*, Fr. Ehrle ed. (Bononiae, 1932) I, p. 126, no. 429.

<sup>5</sup> Ed. cit., fol. 130<sup>r</sup> b.

<sup>6</sup> Ed. cit., verso of unnumbered title page: illud invictissimorum nominalium dogma apud nos tanquam oppressum et decalcum ab inferis ad superos excitaverit; cf. note 4.

<sup>7</sup> Against the testimony of MS Bologna University library 2635, fols. 1<sup>r</sup>-99<sup>v</sup> which attributes an anti-Ockhamist *Logica* to Campsall must be weighed the evidence of his opinions reflected in citations by other authors and, especially, his doctrine and vocabulary on supposition in his first *Quaestio* on the *Prior Analytics* (v. my 'Richard of Campsall, an

*Tractatus de praedestinatione et de praescientia dei et de futuris contingentibus*, which was printed in the 1496 collection immediately before Campsall's *Sayings* on the same subject, remarked that Campsall followed Ockham in his affirmative response to the crucial question: "Is there determinated truth as regards future contingent facts?"<sup>8</sup>

In their manuscript form, Campsall's sixteen theses occupy less than two columns and they fill only a little more than two columns in the Bologna printing; the very brevity of the piece embarrasses the choice of a basic text. It would be naive to prefer the manuscript for no other reason than that its sole competitor is in print, especially since there is reason to suspect that at least one Bologna manuscript, at present unknown, lies behind the incunabulum with exactly the immediacy that links the present edition to the British Museum text.<sup>9</sup> Still, the alternative chosen has been to edit the manuscript text and to record the variants derived from the edition wherever these are more than juxtapositions of words without consequences for the meaning.

Admittedly slight, the chief motive for this decision has been that some features of the printed edition suggest a text that an editor has been at pains to improve. Thus, in the edition, a relatively uniform phrase introduces each thesis: *Primum dictum*, *Secundum dictum est quod*, *Tertium dictum quod*, whereas in the manuscript, only three of the sixteen carry numerals in the text and all are designated by Arabic numerals in the margin. That this concern with uniformity in the work of the Bologna printer is an effort to normalize an author's less mechanical presentation seems far more likely than the contrary hypothesis, that a careful enumeration by the author was deformed in the manuscript but maintained in the edition.

English Theologian of the Fourteenth Century', *Mediaeval Studies* XIV (1952) pp. 6-8, and 'Richard of Campsall's First Question on the Prior Analytics', *Mediaeval Studies* XXIII (1961) pp. 306, 310, 311, 312); the present text seems to confirm his position as a thinker who has affinities with Ockham but who is not to be described as an "Ockhamist."

<sup>8</sup> P. Boehner, *The Tractatus de praedestinatione et de praescientia dei et de futuris contingentibus* of William Ockham, Edited with a Study on the Mediaeval Problem of a Three-valued Logic (Franciscan Institute Publications, No. 2, The Franciscan Institute, St. Bonaventure, N. Y., 1945) pp. 86, 87; cf. p. 76.

<sup>9</sup> M. Grabmann discovered that MS University of Bologna library 1180 (2344), formerly in the possession of the suppressed Convent S. Salvatoris, Bologna, contains no logical works but only 13th century commentaries on natural philosophy and metaphysics, despite this notation by a later hand: *Expositio Guilelmi Ockami in artem veterem cum questionibus Alberti Parvi*; v. his *Mittelalterliches Geistesleben* II, p. 145. The most plausible explanation for this erroneous notation seems to be that the monastic library was in possession of another codex that answered the title mistakenly imposed on this one.

The two formulations of the sixteen *Sayings* do not differ in any serious way, but they are preceded in the edition by some introductory remarks that are missing from the manuscript. This printed introduction poses the problem of divine foreknowledge and future contingents in terms of the proposition: *Antichristus erit*, which occurs in the first and fifth *Sayings*. Admirably conceived to assist a reader, this introduction appears to be just such an expansion of difficult material as might recommend itself to a conscientious and scholarly 15th century editor. Without intending to prejudice a decision on the authenticity of this long variant, for which the evidence is far from adequate, and still less to submerge it in a footnote of unwieldy length, I have included this section of the printed edition: its indentation indicates its absence from the basic text.

In both sources, the *Sayings* are followed by a statement of the conclusions that Campsall thought they justify and the two formulations, although not in contradiction, are by no means identical. As given in the manuscript, the concluding passage is somewhat better organized than is its printed parallel and this is one more motive for preferring the manuscript text: its superiority in this section is redolent of an author's control over his material rather than of editorial revision. Without more extensive evidence, the confidence that can be placed in these judgments is less than could be desired, but the reader has before him what evidence the two known texts provide and the interest of Campsall's theses lies in their doctrinal content which remains intact in both forms. For this reason too, with the exception of the manuscript spelling of Campsall's name, the orthography of the basic text has not been maintained. In the remarks which follow, numerals enclosed in parentheses refer to the apposite *Sayings*.

## II

A proposition that announces an event both future and contingent presents several characteristics that are puzzling precisely because they are necessary. If such a proposition is ever true, at no time can it cease to be true, at no time can it have been untrue. Still, since a future that is genuinely contingent must offer real alternatives, there is a sense in which the falsity of such a true proposition must remain possible. So too, should a proposition concerning a future contingent turn out to be false, then it must have been eternally false. Hence, whether true or false, propositions concerning future contingents cannot be subject to change with respect to their truth value (1, 2, 4, 6). Aristotle had

recorded this view in the ninth chapter of the *Peri hermeneias*, but he decided that it is burdened with indefensible consequences.<sup>10</sup> Concerned to preserve both chance and free choice, neither of which, he was persuaded, can coexist with statements that are "true" or "false" before the event,<sup>11</sup> Aristotle was the more ready to sacrifice the truth or falsity of such propositions because there was no mind to know them in his world. Not a human mind, for our true propositions are true, not because facts correspond to them but because they correspond to facts,<sup>12</sup> and still less the minds of those astronomical deities he would describe in the *Metaphysics*: living, eternal, the best of beings, each one totally absorbed by the thought of itself.<sup>13</sup>

Because he was a *professor sacrae paginae*, Campsall was denied this solution. The God of the Bible knows and speaks whatever is; on occasion, He has spoken to men of what will come to pass contingently. One instance of this is the prophecy: *Antichrist will be*, for Antichrist will be the term of necessitated causes no more than the Messiah he will oppose (1, 5). What cannot be doubted is that God knows and, because He has revealed it, we can know that the future and contingent coming of Antichrist is certain.<sup>14</sup> Hence, "God or another," for an inspired prophet and his hearers share a knowledge that surpasses our natural powers, can know as true before the event one of the contradictories: *Antichrist will be*, *Antichrist will not be*, but not both as true at the same time, nor, as the first *Saying* has established, first one and then the other (3). There is a necessity in the foreknowledge, divine in the last analysis, that coexists with genuine contingency, but the term "necessity" is an ambiguous one. A Christian theologian will distinguish the necessity of "immutability," hall-mark of propositions that bear on future contingents foreknown by God, from the necessity of "inevitability" which is excluded by their very contingency from those free or chance events (2). The truth of these propositions is immutably necessary; that what they assert will come to pass is not inevitably necessary. The security of a proposition on future contingents is factual and fulfillment is certain because the truth value of the proposition is immutable. Such factual security is not identical with the radical

<sup>10</sup> *Peri hermeneias* 9; 18b 18-25, 19a 7-11, 35-19b 4.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.* 18b 5-9, 15-18, 26-19a 6.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.* 18b 36-19a 35.

<sup>13</sup> *Metaphysics* XII, 7; 1072b 13-30.

<sup>14</sup> 1 John 2: 18, 22; 4: 3; 2 John 7; often identified with the homo peccati, filius perditionis of 2 Thess. 2: 3-10.

inevitability that characterizes both non-contingent events and the necessary propositions in which they are expressed. As much can be said for present contingent facts: Peter is now certain of his own beatitude (10). In the factual order, there is a certain necessity to justify this certitude, but it is a necessity such as does not destroy a radical contingency: even as Peter enjoys beatitude he remains the sort of being which, in principle, can lack beatitude. Here Aristotle might have been adduced to support Campsall's position;<sup>15</sup> only when the contingencies of an individual are in the future does the Philosopher hold that "the case is altered."<sup>16</sup>

In his fifth, seventh, eighth, and ninth *Sayings*, Campsall lays down startling theses thanks to an ambiguity in the term "to know" (*scire*). Like Ockham, who has a doctrine of knowledge in the broad sense to cover God's knowledge of all things without exception, of the complex and the incomplex, of the necessary and the contingent, of the false and the impossible, opposed to knowledge in the strict sense, confined to what God knows "as true,"<sup>17</sup> Campsall too gives knowledge more than one meaning. Whatever God knows in the more restricted sense, at any moment in the flux of time, has been and eternally will be known by Him as true. Meanwhile, the inner aptitude of the contingent to be what in fact it is not and will not be, its own opposite by contradiction, entails that God does not ever "know" in the strict sense what He could and would know in that sense if ever it were to come to pass. Yet, in the broad sense, God knows those alternatives without knowing them "as true." The same ambiguity allows the formulation of theses (7, 8, 9) that seem (15) to subordinate the knowledge of God to the caprice of creatures. Furthermore, given an equivocal meaning for "know," it can be said truly that the divine essence both does and does not represent all contradictories (11). Capable of representing all truths, and there-

<sup>15</sup> *Categoriai* 10; 13b 14-35, 11; 14a 7-14; *Peri hermeneias* 7; 17b 26-29.

<sup>16</sup> *Peri hermeneias* 9; 18a 33, 34.

<sup>17</sup> *Tractatus de praedestinatione*, q. 2, Septima suppositio, ed. cit. p. 16; this text with which that of Campsall is associated by its inclusion in the 1496 edition limits knowledge "in the strict sense" more severely than does Campsall: sic idem est quod cognoscere verum, sicut loquitur Philosophus 1<sup>o</sup> Posteriorum, quod nihil scitur nisi verum, thus suggesting that only scientific knowledge that bears on the universal and the necessary is knowledge in the restricted application of the term. But elsewhere Ockham, like Campsall, explains the strict sense in such wise as to include the knowledge of truths that are contingent and singular: v. L. Baudry, *Lexique philosophique de Guillaume d'Ockham* (Paris, 1958) s. v. *scire*, p. 245 where he adduces *Summa totius logicae* III, II, c. 1: Uno modo scire dicitur evidens comprehensio veritatis. Et sic dicuntur sciri non solum necessaria, sed etiam contingentia, sicut scio te sedere et me vivere.



fore free from the peril of representing contradictories simultaneously in the way that constitutes knowledge in the more rigorous sense, the divine essence represents as a known truth but one of such contradictories and that without determination to it (12). The divine intellect, consequently, knows in a wide sense all that is represented in the divine essence but, in the stricter sense, the knowledge of God is true knowledge just because He does not "know as true" the contradictories of true propositions. He does not know contingent possibilities with necessity, as Campsall puts it in a phrase with an unexpectedly modern ring, "unless they are thrown forth," *nisi objiciantur* (13).

Once true, a proposition that asserts a past fact necessarily remains true forever. No matter how contingent, the past cannot be undone. Simple enough when the verb of the proposition which records a contingent event that has occurred is in the past tense, the situation is more complex when the truth of such a statement depends upon the truth of one which announces a future contingent. Both the truth and the contingency of the proposition that records such a past are then dependent upon the truth and contingency that qualify the proposition with respect to the future. It is true to say that "some event was going to come to pass" only if it once was true to say "that event will come to pass" (14).

The knowledge of God, co-terminous with the divine essence in its representative function (13), is independent of all that is not God, despite the fact that the truth of a proposition asserting a future contingent does depend on that future event in all its contingency (15). God's knowledge, necessary in itself, is not necessary in such a way that what is contingently true in the world of creatures should become necessarily true owing to His knowledge of it (cf. 9). No defect in God's knowing, the reason for this is that a contingent event cannot be known with truth to be necessary: *non potest necessario sciri sic* (16).

Against Aristotle, Campsall concludes that certain and infallible cognition can bear upon future contingents and this with four corollaries indigestible by straight Aristotelianism. First, this knowledge cannot be changed into falsity; its truth is permanent. Second, neither such knowledge nor the propositions in which it is expressed can cease to be; as knowledge it is permanent. Third, in such knowledge, there is no succession of truth from one to the other of contradictories. Fourth, no illusion contaminates the certitude of this knowledge: it is right to call it "science" (*scientia*). As contingent as the event it announces, a true proposition concerning a non-necessitated future fact is true for all that; the event comes to pass contingently, but come to pass it does. True

of human knowledge, so much the more do these corollaries hold good of God's knowledge. God has spoken the cosmos, but not everything has been said in the same way. To affirm that God does not "know" the contingent alternatives that will never be realized in exactly the same way in which He knows those that will be fulfilled is no more than to proclaim that there is nothing He does not know. Those alternatives which the passage of time will reveal never to have been realized are not hidden from a divine knowledge that remains necessary in itself (16) without distorting the inner natures that it knows. The world is manifold but God's knowledge is one: *unicus actus indivisibilis*.

Whatever value a theologian may assign to Campsall's wrestlings with the enigma of foreknowledge and contingent futures, the historian will remark that, although a dedicated nominalist could add Campsall's *Sayings* to a work of Ockham's, at least one serious difference assures us of Campsall's independence. On a problem so authentically philosophical that the Philosopher had both raised and solved it to his own satisfaction, Richard of Campsall is content to appeal to purely rational resources for a solution compatible with his faith. William of Ockham, on the other hand, transfers the problem from the philosophers to the saints: that God knows future contingents, he has no doubt, but *debet istud teneri propter dicta Sanctorum*.<sup>18</sup>

## NOTABILIA QUAEDAM MAGISTRI RICHARDI CAMASSALE<sup>1</sup> PRO MATERIA DE CONTINGENTIA ET PRAESCIENTIA DEI<sup>2</sup>

Accipiat<sup>3</sup> igitur ista propositio de futuris: *Antichristus erit*. Ista propositio potest esse falsa, sicut Antichristus potest esse non futurus, sed postquam vera est, non potest successive mutari a veritate in falsitatem, nec e converso. Unde, si ipsa est nunc vera, ab aeterno fuit vera; et tamen, nunc et ab aeterno potuit esse falsa, quia est contingenter vera; et si sit falsa, sicut potest esse falsa, semper et ab aeterno fuit falsa si quis eam<sup>4</sup> formasset, sicut tunc ab aeterno Antichristus non fuisset venturus. Unde, non est imaginandum quod propositio, prius vera, postea mutetur in falsitatem, nec e converso, quia *mutari*

<sup>18</sup> *Tractatus de praedestinatione*, q. 1, ed. cit. p. 15: Ideo dico, quod impossibile est clare exprimere modum, quo Deus scit futura contingentia. Tamen tenendum est, quod sic, contingenter tamen. Et debet istud teneri propter dicta Sanctorum,...

<sup>1</sup> Camassale, a familiar form of Campsall, is retained in the MS spelling.

<sup>2</sup> Title as given in British Museum MS Harley 3243, fol. 88<sup>v</sup> a.

<sup>3</sup> Indented introduction, Accipiatur... sequuntur aliqua dicta, from Bologna edition of Ockham's *Expositio aurea*, fol. 113<sup>v</sup> b, v. supra.

<sup>4</sup> *em. cas.*

est *aliter se habere nunc quam prius*, et sic nulla propositio talis mutatur a veritate in falsitatem. Et nota quod, quando Antichristus est jam creatus et non futurus, tunc Deus non scit ipsum esse futurum, sed factum; nec tamen Deus mutatur, sed sufficit mutatio objecti quod tunc se habet aliter quam prius. Ex quibus sequuntur aliqua dicta:

Primum.<sup>5</sup> Aliqua propositio est contingenter vera, et tamen, non potest mutari a veritate in falsitatem, quamvis possit esse falsa.

Ratio est quia ista: *Antichristus erit*, est vera et potest esse falsa, sed, si falsa ponatur, ab aeterno falsa fuit, ita quod ibi non esset mutatio, et illud<sup>6</sup> respondendum est de propositionibus de futuro.

Secundum.<sup>7</sup> Aliqua propositio est vera, et potest esse falsa, et tamen, non potest cessare esse vera.

Quia, si cessaret a veritate,<sup>8</sup> mutaretur a veritate in falsitatem; eodem<sup>9</sup> modo est falsa et potest esse vera, et tamen, non potest cessare esse falsa, quia,<sup>10</sup> si falsa<sup>11</sup> ponatur, ab aeterno fuit falsa et, per consequens, non incipit<sup>12</sup> esse falsa et, si non incipit<sup>13</sup> esse falsa, non desinit esse vera. Et ita<sup>14</sup> intendit doctor cum dicit quod ibi est necessitas immutabilitatis, sed non inevitabilitatis.

Tertium.<sup>15</sup> Deus vel alius potest scire utrumque contradictoriorum, et tamen, nec<sup>16</sup> utrumque simul nec unum post alterum.

Quia, utrumque potest esse verum, et tamen, nec simul nec alterum post alterum; patet ex primo notabili.

4.<sup>17</sup> Aliqua sunt contradictoria quorum utrumque potest esse verum, nec tamen simul nec unum post alterum.

5.<sup>18</sup> Aliqua sunt<sup>19</sup> quae non sciuntur a Deo, et<sup>20</sup> possunt sciri ab eo,

<sup>5</sup> *marg.* Primum MS; *add.* dictum.

<sup>6</sup> hoc est tenendum.

<sup>7</sup> *mar.* 2<sup>m</sup> MS; *add.* dictum est quod.

<sup>8</sup> *add.* jam.

<sup>9</sup> *om.* eodem modo est . . . cessare esse falsa.

<sup>10</sup> quod.

<sup>11</sup> *om.* falsa.

<sup>12</sup> incepit.

<sup>13</sup> incepit.

<sup>14</sup> istud intendunt doctores cum dicunt.

<sup>15</sup> *Marg.* 3, text 3<sup>m</sup> MS; *add.* dictum quod.

<sup>16</sup> non.

<sup>17</sup> *marg.* 4 MS; *add.* dictum quod.

<sup>18</sup> *marg.* 5 MS; *add.* dictum quod.

<sup>19</sup> *om.* sunt quae.

<sup>20</sup> quae.

et tamen, si nunc<sup>21</sup> scirentur<sup>22</sup> a Deo, non aliter se habuissent nunc quam prius se habuissent vel quam ab aeterno se habuerunt.

Nam si illa quae nunc non sunt scita essent scita a Deo, semper fuissent scita et, per consequens, non aliter se haberent nunc quam prius, tunc ab aeterno se habuissent si essent nunc<sup>23</sup> a Deo scita; Deus enim potest scire Antichristum non venturum sicut Antichristus potest esse non venturus.

6.<sup>24</sup> Aliqua propositio ab aeterno fuit vera quae potest esse falsa et tamen, si esset falsa, non aliter se haberet quam ab aeterno<sup>25</sup> habuisset.<sup>26</sup>

7.<sup>27</sup> Ego possem<sup>28</sup> facere aliquam propositionem fuisse scitam a Deo quae<sup>29</sup> non est scita a<sup>30</sup> Deo et e converso.

Quia, ponatur quod .a. numquam eveniet,<sup>31</sup> posito tamen<sup>32</sup> quod, cum hoc<sup>33</sup> .a. dependeat a libera voluntate mea, possum facere quod .a. eveniet et sequitur propositum quia, si eveniet a voluntate mea, ab aeterno fuit scitum a<sup>34</sup> Deo .a. debere evenire.

8.<sup>35</sup> Possum facere aliquam propositionem semper fuisse veram quae tamen numquam fuit vera.

Quia, si possum facere quod .a. eveniet, ego<sup>36</sup> possum facere quod haec est <sup>37</sup> vera: .a. *eveniet* sed, si haec sit vera, .a. *eveniet*, semper fuit vera, et tunc ultra sequitur quod Deus ab aeterno scivit .a. fore. Sed, qui potest facere quod antecedens sit verum, potest facere quod consequens sit verum; ergo,<sup>38</sup> ex quo possum facere quod haec sit vera: .a. *eveniet*, possum facere quod Deus ab<sup>39</sup> aeterno scivit illud quod numquam scivit.<sup>40</sup>

<sup>21</sup> *om.* nunc.

<sup>22</sup> *add.* modo.

<sup>23</sup> *om.* nunc.

<sup>24</sup> *margin.* 6 MS; *add.* dictum quod.

<sup>25</sup> *add.* se.

<sup>26</sup> *add.* Patet ex quinto.

<sup>27</sup> *margin.* 7 MS; *add.* dictum quod.

<sup>28</sup> possum.

<sup>29</sup> *add.* ab eo.

<sup>30</sup> *om.* a Deo.

<sup>31</sup> *add.* tunc Deus nunquam scivit .a. evenire et tamen hoc.

<sup>32</sup> *om.* tamen quod.

<sup>33</sup> *om.* hoc.

<sup>34</sup> *om.* a Deo.

<sup>35</sup> *margin.* 8 MS; *add.* dictum quod.

<sup>36</sup> *om.* ego.

<sup>37</sup> sit.

<sup>38</sup> igitur si possum facere.

<sup>39</sup> *om.* ab aeterno.

<sup>40</sup> *add.* et sic possum facere quod Deus sciat illud quod nunquam scivit nec sciet.

9.<sup>41</sup> Aliquid fuit et tamen numquam postea posset<sup>42</sup> esse et tamen non erit<sup>43</sup> necessarium illud transisse in praeteritum.

Quia, sit .b. instans praeteritum in quo Deus scivit: .a. fore pro futuro tunc, haec fuit vera:<sup>44</sup> .a. fore in .b. est<sup>45</sup> verum. Et numquam erit vera nec potest esse vera quia .b. instans, cum sit praeteritum, non potest fore, et tamen, non est necessarium illud transisse nec<sup>46</sup> necessario transit in praeteritum, quia ista: Deus scivit .a. in .b. fore est contingens similiter et ejus veritas. Et quamvis transivit,<sup>47</sup> adhuc veritas ejus est contingens quia dependet ab una de futuro quae est contingens, scilicet ab illa: .a. erit quae est contingens. Nisi enim .a.<sup>48</sup> debet fore,<sup>49</sup> non scivisset .a. in .b. instanti praeterito fore. Unde<sup>50</sup> propositio de praeterito vera<sup>51</sup> non est necessaria quae dependet a futuro contingenti.

10.<sup>52</sup> Aliquid est factum quod potest non esse factum, sicut Petrus jam<sup>53</sup> est certus de sua beatitudine, et heri fuit certus, et tamen potest<sup>54</sup> non esse certus.

11.<sup>55</sup> In divina essentia, oppositum istorum contradictorie, quae modo repraesentantur, potest ab aeterno non<sup>56</sup> repraesentari, sed non simul quoad complexa.

12.<sup>57</sup> Divina essentia habet unum modum repraesentandi, licet non determinetur ad unum oppositum.<sup>58</sup>

13.<sup>59</sup> Quamvis divinus intellectus sciât omne<sup>60</sup> repraesentatum in divina essentia, et solum<sup>61</sup> illud, tamen aliquid potest scire quod actu

<sup>41</sup> marg. 9 MS: add. dictum quod.

<sup>42</sup> potest.

<sup>43</sup> est.

<sup>44</sup> add. Deus scit.

<sup>45</sup> om. est verum.

<sup>46</sup> om. nec necessario transit.

<sup>47</sup> transierit.

<sup>48</sup> om. .a.

<sup>49</sup> add. Deus.

<sup>50</sup> add. nulla.

<sup>51</sup> om. vera non.

<sup>52</sup> marg. 10 MS; add. dictum quod.

<sup>53</sup> om. jam.

<sup>54</sup> add. de ea.

<sup>55</sup> marg. 11 MS; add. dictum quod.

<sup>56</sup> om. non.

<sup>57</sup> marg. 12 MS; add. dictum quod.

<sup>58</sup> obiectum.

<sup>59</sup> om. 13, add. Unde; mar. 13 MS.

<sup>60</sup> add. omne.

<sup>61</sup> om. solum illud.

non repraesentatur in ea, sed potest in<sup>62</sup> ea repraesentari; patet ex .xi. Et<sup>63</sup> quamvis divinae essentiae conveniat naturaliter repraesentare, non tamen necessario respectu contingentium, nisi<sup>64</sup> objiciantur.

14.<sup>65</sup> In propositione de praeterito, vera quando actus<sup>66</sup> exercitus per verbum praeteriti temporis, non transit sed perma(a/b)net,<sup>67</sup> vel, quando illa<sup>68</sup> de praeterito dependet a futuro contingenti, tunc illa de praeterito ita est contingens sicut<sup>69</sup> de futuro, sicut ista: .a. fuit futurum dependet ab ista: .a. erit futurum.<sup>70</sup>

15.<sup>71</sup> Quamvis scientia Dei non dependeat ab aliquo extra Deum, tamen veritas istius<sup>72</sup> propositionis: *Deus scit .a. fore* dependet ex aliquo extra.

16.<sup>73</sup> Quamvis scientia Dei sit in se necessaria, tamen Deus non scivit<sup>74</sup> necessario .a. quia est contingens, et ideo non potest necessario sciri sic quod Deus noscat eam necessario esse veram.

Ex istis 16<sup>75</sup> dictis patet quod certa et infallibilis cognitio potest haberi de futuris contingentibus, sine mutatione a veritate in falsitatem,<sup>76</sup> sine desitione veritatis, vel<sup>77</sup> successione falsitatis post<sup>78</sup> veritatem, vel deceptione<sup>79</sup> in scientia, quia propositio potest esse contingenter<sup>80</sup> vera<sup>81</sup> et tamen non mutari de<sup>82</sup> veritate in falsitatem, nec desinere esse vera, etc.; igitur,<sup>83</sup> multo magis Deus potest aliquid scire contingenter et tamen<sup>84</sup>

<sup>62</sup> *om.* in ea.

<sup>63</sup> *om.* Et; *add.* XIII dictum quia.

<sup>64</sup> *om.* nisi objiciantur.

<sup>65</sup> *marg.* 14 MS; *add.* XIII dictum quod.

<sup>66</sup> *add.* est.

<sup>67</sup> *add.* semper.

<sup>68</sup> *add.* propositio.

<sup>69</sup> *add.* illa.

<sup>70</sup> *add.* quae est contingens.

<sup>71</sup> *marg.* 15 MS; *add.* dictum quod.

<sup>72</sup> *hujus.*

<sup>73</sup> *marg.* 16 MS; *add.* dictum quod.

<sup>74</sup> *novit.*

<sup>75</sup> *om.* 16 dictis.

<sup>76</sup> *add.* et.

<sup>77</sup> et in falsitatem.

<sup>78</sup> *om.* post veritatem.

<sup>79</sup> deceptionem.

<sup>80</sup> contingens.

<sup>81</sup> *om.* vera.

<sup>82</sup> *om.* de veritate in . . . esse vera etc.

<sup>83</sup> et.

<sup>84</sup> *add.* ejus.

scientia non potest mutari<sup>85</sup> in falsitatem, nec<sup>86</sup> arguit desitionem in scientia sicut nec in propositione, nec successionem, ita quod Deus<sup>87</sup> potest scire<sup>88</sup> quod non scit sine successione,<sup>89</sup> quia unicus<sup>90</sup> actus indivisibilis est. Nec arguit deceptionem quia non omnis, quia<sup>91</sup> est certus, est necessario certus, sicut<sup>92</sup> Petrus est certus de sua beatitudine, et tamen contingenter, quia potest esse<sup>93</sup> non beatus. Unde, contingentia nullum illorum quattuor arguit in Deo, sicut nec in propositione, ut satis clare patet ex dictis.

*Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies*

<sup>85</sup> *add.* a veritate.

<sup>86</sup> *om.* nec arguit desitionem . . . successionem ita quod.

<sup>87</sup> *om.* Deus.

<sup>88</sup> *add.* re aliquid.

<sup>89</sup> *add.* tamen.

<sup>90</sup> actus est unicus quo scit omnia.

<sup>91</sup> qui.

<sup>92</sup> ut.

<sup>93</sup> *om.* esse non beatus . . . patet ex dictis; *add.* carere ea. Expliciunt dicta sexdecim venerabilis Ricardi de capsali de futuris contingentibus.

# The Constitution "Cum ex eo" of Boniface VIII

EDUCATION OF PAROCHIAL CLERGY

LEONARD E. BOYLE O. P.

THE release of canons and other higher clergy from their benefices for purposes of study seems to have been an established custom by the end of the twelfth century.<sup>1</sup> From the same period onwards it was also not uncommon for individual bishops to grant a similar leave of absence to rectors and others who were engaged personally in the *cura animarum*. After the great pastoral reforms of the Fourth Lateran Council this practice in respect of rectors began to increase. By the middle of the thirteenth century it was largely taken for granted, although it varied in intensity from bishopric to bishopric.<sup>2</sup> It was not, however, until the pontificate of Pope Boniface VIII and the appearance of his constitution *Cum ex eo*, that the church as a whole realized at the highest level the possibilities of dispensation for study as a means of providing some educational facilities for the parochial clergy in general. It is with this constitution *Cum ex eo* that the present article is primarily concerned, and with its legislation for, and encouragement of, the release of rectors and vicars from their *cura animarum* for studies at universities. It does not propose to treat of the general subject of the presence of beneficed clergy in universities, nor of privileges granted to certain universities in virtue of which students could live off the fruits of their benefices for some or all of their years of study.<sup>3</sup> We shall therefore deal firstly with the background of the constitution *Cum ex eo*, then with the nature and limits of the legislation, finally with some of the effects which *Cum ex eo* had on the life of the church in the fourteenth, fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, from the pontificate of Boniface VIII until the Council of Trent.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See, for example, X [=Decretales Gregorii IX], 3.5,12, and the discussion in L. Thomassinus, *Vetus et nova disciplina circa beneficia et beneficiaria* (Venice, 1752), II, 616.

<sup>2</sup> See J. R. H. Moorman, *Church Life in England in the Thirteenth Century* (Cambridge, 1946) 31, 96; M. Gibbs and J. Lang, *Bishops and Reform* (Oxford, 1934) 164.

<sup>3</sup> On these privileges see F. Pegues, 'Ecclesiastical provisions for the support of students in the thirteenth century,' *Church History* 26 (1957) 307-317.

<sup>4</sup> The present article is an expanded version of a note communicated at the XIth International Congress of Historical Sciences, Stockholm 1960: see *Actes du Congrès* (Göteborg-Stockholm, 1962), 259.



## I

It is well-known, of course, that there was ecclesiastical legislation on the education of candidates for the priesthood long before 1298, but it must be acknowledged that there was none which met the needs of the parochial clergy in general as specifically or as attractively as Boniface's constitution *Cum ex eo*.

In 1179, for example, the Third Lateran Council had attempted to provide for the elementary education of clerics, ordaining that a grammar master should be appointed in every cathedral,<sup>5</sup> but, if we may judge from remarks of the Fourth Lateran Council some thirty six years later, the measure must have met with little success. Strengthening the previous statute: *quoniam in multis ecclesiis id minime observatur*, this Council ordered that in addition to the master decreed by the earlier Council, metropolitan churches should also possess a theologian who would instruct priests and other clerics in the scriptures and prepare them for pastoral work.<sup>6</sup> Four years later Honorius III introduced a measure which further improved the educational facilities available to the clergy. In a letter of 1219 which was later incorporated into the *Compilatio Quinta* (a collection of Honorius's decrees) and into the *Decretales* (1234) commissioned by Gregory IX, Honorius ruled, among other things, that bishops and chapters should send some promising clerics (*aliqui docibiles*) to universities for the study of theology, and that these should enjoy the fruits of their benefices for five years while engaged in this study; this would help to offset a scarcity of teachers which some prelates might use as an excuse for their failure to observe the decree of IV Lateran.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>5</sup> Can. 18 (P. Labbe-G. Cossart, *Sacrosancta Concilia*, ed. N. Coleti, Venice, 1728-1733, X, 1518); X. 5.5.1.

<sup>6</sup> Can. 11 (Labbe-Cossart, *Concilia*, XIa, 164); X. 5.5.4.

<sup>7</sup> *Super specula...* Volumus et mandamus ut statutum, in concilio generali de magistris theologis per singulas metropoles statuendis inviolabiliter observetur, statuentes insuper de consilio fratrum nostrorum, ac districte praecipiendo mandantes, ut, quia super hoc propter raritatem magistrorum se possent forsan aliqui excusare, ab ecclesiarum praelatis et capitulis ad theologiae professionis studium aliqui docibiles destinentur, qui, cum docti fuerint, in Dei ecclesia velut splendor fulgeant firmamenti, ex quibus postmodum copia possit haberi doctorum qui velut stellae in perpetuas aeternitates mansuri ad iustitiam valeant plurimos erudire, quibus, si proprii proventus ecclesiastici non sufficiunt, praedicti necessaria subministrent. Docentes vero in theologica facultate, dum in scholis docuerint, et studentes in ipsa, integre per annos quinque, percipiant de licentia sedis apostolicae proventus praebendarum et beneficiorum suorum, non obstante aliqua alia consuetudine vel statuto, cum denario fraudari non debeant in vinea Domini operantes. Hoc autem inconcusse volumus

But once more the response was a long way from being ready or universal. Almost forty years afterwards St. Thomas would note in a polemical writing against William of Saint-Amour :

propter litteratorum inopiam, nec adhuc per saeculares potuerit observari statutum Lateranensis Concilii, ut in singulis ecclesiis metropolitanis essent aliqui, qui theologiam docerent, quod tamen per religiosos, Dei gratia, cernimus multo latius impletum, quam etiam fuerit statutum<sup>8</sup>.

The great canonist and Cardinal, Hostiensis, a year or two before his death in 1271, was even more blunt in his description of the indifference to the decree of IV Lateran and to Honorius's attempt to promote it :

Sed quidquid velit, quidquid mandet, adhuc non observatur, unde et adhuc aut nullus aut rarus est fructus statuti ipsius et multorum aliorum... Non est culpa statuti, quod in se rationabile fuit et utile, sed culpa subditorum inobedientium, et statuentis non corrigentis, ac negligentiam praelatorum.<sup>9</sup>

Although these decrees of III and IV Lateran, and the decretal letter *Super specula* of Honorius III, are very important in the history of ecclesiastical education,<sup>10</sup> they were to a great extent limited to the

observari, firmiter disponentes, quod feriantur poena debita transgressores. (*Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis*, ed. H. Denifle O.P. and E. Chatelain, I (Paris, 1889), 91; X. 5.5,5). This passage is from one of the three parts into which the decretal letter *Super specula* of 16 November 1219 was divided when the *Compilatio Quinta* was formed before 1226. The division was taken over by Raymund of Peñafort when compiling the *Decretales* issued by Gregory IX in 1234, as follows: X. 3.50,10 (Ne clerici vel monachi saecularibus negotiis se immisceant), the present X. 5.5,5 (De magistris, et ne aliquid exigatur pro licentia docendi), and X. 5.33,28 (De privilegiis et de excessibus privilegiatorum).

<sup>8</sup> *Contra impugnantes Dei cultum et religionem*, ed. R. M. Spiazzi O. P., (Turin-Rome, 1954), n. 130, p. 31. St. Thomas is arguing the necessity for a learned religious order, specially set up to help out those engaged in the pastoral care: Eis qui procurant salutem animarum, necessarium est ut vita et scientia clareant: ex quibus non de facili possent tot inveniri qui singulis parochiis per universum mundum praeficerentur, cum etiam propter litteratorum inopiam (as above)... quam etiam fuerit statutum... Ergo saluberrime religio aliqua instituitur in qua sint homines litterati et studio vacantes ad iuvandum sacerdotes qui ad hoc minus sufficientur.

<sup>9</sup> *Lectura in quinque libros decretalium* (Venice, 1580), p. 30<sup>ra</sup>. The comment was, perhaps, too harsh. In some regions an attempt was being made at the particular time when Hostiensis was writing; for example, at the Council of Tarragona in 1266 it was ordered: quod in singulis ecclesiis cathedralibus nostrae provinciae, duae personae indoneae docibiles de gremio ecclesiae... eligantur, quae in theologia vel de iure canonico studeant... Quibus sufficienter edoctis... alii duo successive ad studium destinantur... (J. Tetada y Ramiro, *Colección des canones y de todos los concilios de la Iglesia de España y de America*, (Madrid, 1859-1863), VI, 53).

<sup>10</sup> See P. Mandonnet O. P., 'La crise scolaire au début du xiii<sup>e</sup> siècle et la fondation de l'ordre des Frères-Prêcheurs', *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique* 15 (1914) 34-39 (reprinted in Mandonnet's *Saint Dominique*, ed. M. H. Vicaire and R. Ladner, Paris, 1938, II, 83-100).

provision of teachers in centres of education. The point of III Lateran was the setting aside of benefices for teachers of grammar in cathedral churches; that of IV Lateran was the same, with the addition of benefices for teachers of theology; that of *Super specula* was the maintenance of a supply of graduates who would man the cathedral chairs.<sup>11</sup> Priests engaged in the pastoral care would benefit only indirectly, in so far as the three decrees placed teachers of grammar or of theology at their disposal. *Super specula*, of course, differs from the two earlier constitutions in that it allowed those sent by bishops and chapters for theological studies to have the revenues from their benefices for five years, but it does not at all envisage *licentiae studendi* of which the generality of clerics engaged in the *cura animarum* could avail themselves while continuing to enjoy the fruits of their benefices.<sup>11a</sup> There is no doubt that many rectors were released for university studies in the period after 1219, and that these would enjoy the privilege of revenues for five years granted by *Super specula*, if they studied theology.<sup>12</sup> But whether they were released by bishops in compliance with Honorius' scheme to provide a supply of teachers of theology, or for studies in general, there was an obstacle to be overcome first which is not at all covered by *Super specula*. For rectors and those entrusted with a direct *cura animarum* were obliged by the Third Lateran Council to exercise their cure of souls *per se*.<sup>12a</sup> Therefore, when licences for study were granted to rectors, whether for theology or for any other branch of study, there had to be a justification of non-residence other than the constitution of Honorius III and that of IV Lateran, both of which decrees, in any case, probably were thinking in terms of the young men in the cathedral schools or on cathedral staffs, and not of those already committed to the *cura animarum*.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. the *Glossa ordinaria* on the word "docibiles" of Honorius's letter: *docibiles: id est habiles ad docendum, et isti a capitulis possunt eligi ut mittantur et postmodum doceant*.

<sup>11a</sup> The impression given by some authors, however, is that *Super specula* was a blanket decree for all beneficed clergy and not just for those who were to function as teachers of theology in the metropolitan churches, for example, by A. L. Leach, *Educational Charters and Documents 598 to 1909* (Cambridge, 1911) 144-147; *id.*, *The Schools of Medieval England* (Cambridge, 1915) 156-157.

<sup>12</sup> The direct import of Honorius's words seems to be that only theological students sent to a university in accordance with *Super specula* would enjoy their revenues for five years, but in fact *studentes* were not restricted to this class, for, as Panormitanus (Nicholas de Tudeschis, 1386-1453) says: *scholares sive sint missi sive non habent hoc privilegium per quinquennium* (*Commentarium in quinque libros Decretalium* (Lyons, 1527), III, fol. 127<sup>ra</sup>).

<sup>12a</sup> X. 3.4.3.

As it happens, there was a way out of the decree of III Lateran on residence which was independent of, and indeed antedates, both IV Lateran and *Super specula*. This was to be found in a letter of Alexander III to the Archbishop of York a few years after the Third Lateran Council, which later was incorporated into the *Compilatio prima* (about 1192) and into the *Decretales* of Gregory IX, and thus gained a wider hearing. Answering a question about the recent Lateran decree on residence *per se*, Alexander wrote that clerics who had been installed in a church or a benefice to which a cure of souls was attached, legally could be removed if they were unwilling to reside there or to perform their duties in person: *nisi forte de licentia suorum praelatorum, vel studio litterarum, vel pro aliis honestis causis, contigerit eos abesse*.<sup>13</sup> From the tone of the letter, indeed, it seems that Alexander was not innovating when he countenanced absence on episcopal licence for the purpose of study, but was rather stating a practice which was in fact common, although not explicitly covered in the Lateran decree on residence.<sup>14</sup>

For almost a hundred years afterwards, bishops who granted licences for study had therefore an authoritative interpretation of the decree of III Lateran with which to rebut charges of transgressing the statute or of encouraging absenteeism from the *cura animarum*. In 1274, however, the situation changed. For when Gregory X published the decrees of II Lyons in that year, he included a post-conciliar constitution *Licet canon* which renewed the Lateran statute on residence and on ordination to the priesthood, and imposed a penalty of *ipso facto* deprivation for a failure to observe its conditions.<sup>15</sup> The only concession to non-residence

<sup>13</sup> Relatum est nobis ex parte tua, quod, cum in Lateranensi concilio statutum sit, ut personae tali ecclesiae vel beneficium ecclesiasticum conferatur, quae residere in loco et curam eius per se valeat exercere, nonnulli ad ecclesias praesentati hoc se posse affirmant, sed efficere contradicunt. Ideo [nos] consulere voluisti, an propter hoc tales possis praesentatos repellere, vel institutos sublato appellationis obstaculo remove. Cum igitur verba accipienda sint cum effectu, tales, si praesentati fuerint, non debent admitti, et admissi, si instituti fuerint, licite poterunt amoveri; nisi forte de licentia suorum praelatorum, vel studio litterarum, vel pro aliis honestis causis, contigerit eos abesse (X. 3.4.4).

<sup>14</sup> See remarks of Thomassinus, *Vetus et nova disciplina*, II, 616.

<sup>15</sup> *Licet canon*, a felicitis recordationis Alexandro Papa III praedecessore nostro editus, inter cetera statuerit, ut nullus regimen ecclesiae parochialis suscipiat, nisi xxv annum aetatis attigerit, ac scientia et moribus commendandus existat, quodque talis ad regimen assumptus huiusmodi, si monitus non fuerit praefixa a canonibus tempore in presbyterum ordinatus, a regiminis eiusdem amoveatur officio, et alii conferatur; quia tamen in observatione canonis memorati se multi exhibent negligentes, nos, periculosam illorum negligentiam volentes iuris executione supplere, praesenti decreto statuimus, ut nullus ad

was that a bishop could grant a dispensation: *ad tempus*, prout *causa rationabilis* id exposcit.

In the next twenty five years some bishops would, no doubt, stretch "*causa rationabilis*" to cover licences of absence for study,<sup>16</sup> but in fact *Licet canon* made no explicit allowance for the prolonged absence that study would involve, nor did it make any reference whatsoever to Alexander's *declaratio* of III Lateran. Indeed it was on this very point of study that the Gregorian constitution<sup>16a</sup> was subjected to some sharp criticism. In attempting to stem absenteeism, the critics said, *Licet canon* in effect shut most of the parochial clergy off from all hope of education. The famous canonist Durandus the Elder, writing about 1291-2, said that it had killed an old and advantageous custom; a consequence of the

regimen parochialis ecclesiae assumatur, nisi sit idoneus moribus, scientia et aetate, decernentes, collationes de parochialibus ecclesiis, his, qui non attigerit xxv annum, de cetero faciendas viribus omnino carere. Is etiam, qui ad huiusmodi regimen assumetur, ut gregis sibi crediti diligentius curam gerere possit, in parochiali ecclesia, cuius rector exstiterit, residere personaliter tenetur, et infra annum, a sibi commissi regiminis tempore numerandum, se faciat ad sacerdotium promovere. Quod si infra idem tempus promotus non fuerit, ecclesia sibi commissa, nulla etiam praemissa monitione, sit praesentis constitutionis auctoritate privatus. Super residentia vero (ut praemittitur) facienda, possit ordinarius gratiam dispensationis ad tempus facere, prout *causa rationabilis* id exposcit. (Labbe-Cossart, *Concilia*, XIV. 983; Sext, 1.6.14).

<sup>16</sup> For example, by Archbishop Wickwane of York in 1280, 1281, 1282: *The Register of William Wickwane of York 1279-1285* (Surtees Society, York, 1907) 38-9, 84-5; and by Bishop Swinfield of Hereford in 1283, 1285, 1287: *Registrum Ricardi de Swinfield Episcopi Herefordensis 1283-1317*, ed. W. W. Capes (Canterbury and York Society, Oxford, 1915) 545.

<sup>16a</sup> Although the constitution *Licet canon* is generally regarded as an act of the second Council of Lyons, and was, of course, issued with conciliar authority, it is in fact a personal decree of Gregory X, being one of the four constitutions which Gregory added to, and published with, the decrees of the Council itself some five months after the Council had ended. This is clearly pointed out by the canonist Durandus the Elder (Speculator) who was a secretary to Gregory at the Council and drew up some of its decrees (G. Durandus, *In sacrosanctum concilium Lugdunense commentarius*, ed. S. Maiolo (Fani, 1569), fol. iv). But despite Finke's great work on the decrees of II Lyons (H. Finke, *Konzilienstudien zur Geschichte des 13. Jahrhunderts* (Münster-in W., 1891, 1-15), and that of E. Fournier on much the same ground: *Questions d'Histoire du Droit canonique* (Paris, 1936) 7-31, there is still a widespread impression that all the constitutions published by Gregory X on 1 Nov. 1274 are constitutions drawn up at the Council of Lyons itself (see S. Kuttner, 'Conciliar law in the making. The Lyonese constitutions (1274) of Gregory X...', *Miscellanea Pio Paschini* (Rome, 1949), II, 39-81). The credit of reasserting the true composition of the "Lyons" constitutions as they are found in Mansi, Labbe-Cossart, etc., is usually given to Finke, but the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries were not unaware of the distinction between "Lyons" and "Gregorian" constitutions. For example, the Dominican savant Noël Alexandre was well aware of it in 1676-1686, when writing his *Historia Ecclesiastica* (ed. C. Roncaglia (Lucca, 1734), VIII, 427-432).

decree, he feared, would be that 'infra breve tempus pauci viri litterati invenientur.'<sup>17</sup>

Six or seven years later Boniface VIII leaves one with the impression that the misgiving was not confined to professional legal circles.<sup>18</sup> In his preamble to his constitution *Cum ex eo* in 1298, he states that *Licet canon* has had the effect of making many clerics reluctant to seek appointments to parochial churches. There were complaints, many of which had reached Boniface himself, that the obligations of permanent residence, and of ordination within a year of institution, gave the parochial clergy small prospect of improving their education, since, for most of them, an education was out of the question unless they had a benefice for their support while studying. Boniface's statement that complaints had reached him from many quarters is probably not an exaggeration. If only Durandus among the canonists seems to have taken a dislike to *Licet canon*, one official protest exists to suggest that dissatisfaction was perhaps as widespread as Boniface (and Durandus) give us to understand. Promulgating the Lyons' and Gregorian constitutions at the Council of Reading in 1279, Archbishop Pecham declared that a strict enforcement of the decree<sup>19</sup> would mean that the English parochial clergy could no longer be trained in philosophy and the arts, since few clerics were rich enough to study at a university without some endowment.<sup>20</sup> He therefore suggested that a letter should be sent to the

<sup>17</sup> Haec autem constitutio in plerisque provinciis in quibus pauca sunt beneficia sine cura perquam dura est et damnosa: nam olim episcopi in talibus dispensabant et cum hiis beneficiis multi proficiebant in scientia litterali, hodie vero, quia pauperes non habent unde proficiant, divites vero nollunt providere filiis ut statim presbiteri fiant, nisi remedium adhibeatur, infra brevi tempus pauci viri litterati invenientur... (*Commentarius*, ed. cit., fol. 7r). It is remarkable how well this summarizes the complaint of Pecham and the letter of the Council of Reading to which we are about to refer.

<sup>18</sup> Whether or not this was at all widespread in these circles cannot be stated definitely at the moment. The Bolognese canonist Garsias Hispanus in his apparatus on the Gregorian constitutions does not question *Licet canon* (Bodleian Library, Oxford, MS Canon P.L. 144), nor apparently do the commentaries on these constitutions described by E. Fournier, *Questions d'Histoire*, pp. 32-46, and in his *Nouvelles recherches sur les Curies, Chapitres et Universitaires de l'ancienne Eglise de France* (Arras, 1942) 222-240. The constitution seems, in fact, to have been rigidly enforced; see, for example, the directive of Pope Nicholas III in 1278: Item scribatur diocesanis quod canonicos et rectores ecclesiarum sibi subiectarum residere compellant in eis per subtractionem proventuum, nisi habeant indulgentiam vel domini Papae vel cardinalium obsequiis immorentur. (M. Tangl, *Die päpstlichen Kanzleiordnungen von 1200-1500* (Innsbruck, 1894), 77).

<sup>19</sup> Which Pecham, like Boniface VIII later, regarded simply as an act of the Council of Lyons.

<sup>20</sup> Cum iuniores annis et ordinibus quam sacerdotii constituti quamcumque perydonei ad

Pope requesting certain mitigations of *Licet canon*, both of the age limit and of the obligation of residence; all the bishops should endorse it, and the support of the King, barons and whole community of the realm should be canvassed.<sup>21</sup> However, although the letter, a remarkable document, was drafted, this was as far as the complaint was carried. As the cleric who copied it into a Salisbury register noted, it was never sent, 'quia clerus nolebat contribuere.'<sup>22</sup>

Although other representations of which we do not know at present

scienciam litterarum per hunc modum a beneficiis ecclesiasticis penitus excludantur; cum ecclesia anglicana parum prebendis habundat et pro maiori parte beneficia non habeat nisi quibus cura imminet [MS munet] animarum... cumque persone huiusmodi in numerositate plurima constitute quamcumque zelantes ad studium aliunde non habeant facultates quibus in studio sustententur, nec ad beneficia ecclesiastica optinenda habiles, recedunt a studio, qui, si doctrine vacarent, nobilissimi in ecclesia Dei per processum temporis efficerentur ministri quorum ministerio perpetuo per hunc modum defraudatur cotidie ecclesia anglicana... (Bodleian Library, Oxford, MS Bodley 794, fol. 180<sup>v</sup>-180<sup>r</sup>). This passage appears in the *Acta* of the Council of Reading which are preserved in a few manuscripts; it is not printed in D. Wilkins, *Concilia Magnae Britanniae et Hiberniae* (London, 1737), II, 33-5. On the *Acta* see C. R. Cheney, 'Legislation of the Medieval English Church', *English Historical Review* 50 (1935) 407-8, and on the Council of Reading, D.L. Douie, *Archbishop Pecham* (Oxford, 1952) 95-105.

<sup>21</sup> Ideo si vobis placet in communi scribere domino pape... parati sumus et nos scribendo et interpellando vobis assistere in hac parte; et credimus expedire etiam quod dominus rex a vobis interpellatus ut ipse et omnes comites et barones totaque communitas super ista materia summum pontificem communiter interpellent per solempnes nuncios communiter deputandos, per quos alleviationem tanti gravaminis circa institutiones expectant et commendas: circa institutiones siquidem quod minor xxv annis ad beneficium curam animarum habens annexum possunt assumi cum aliquo moderamine per sedem apostolicam providendo, quodque is cui cura animarum committitur ad sacerdotium infra annum minime compellatur... (MS Bodley 794, fol. 181<sup>r</sup>).

<sup>22</sup> Salisbury Diocesan Registry, *Liber Evidentiarius C*, p. 321 (o.f., 148<sup>r</sup>). The draft of this letter exists in one other known MS, the Register of Godfrey Giffard, bishop of Worcester (1268-1301), fol. 99 (Worcester Diocesan Registry). I owe a transcript of the Worcester copy, with collations from Liber Evidentiarius C, to the generosity of Miss Decima Douie. As the letter is rather long, the following extract must suffice here: Supplicatio domino pape ne rectores privarentur qui non sunt in primum annum in presbiterum ordinati... Circa institutiones pariter et commendas a tanto constitutionum rigore in ecclesia anglicana expediret recedere, nisi mandati vestri necessitas nos traheret et aliorum et in contrarium cohartaret, cum sit ibi beneficiorum paucitas sine cura multique precipue nobiles ab assecutione beneficiorum huiusmodi se propter statutorum duriciam abstinebunt, dumque ad beneficia huiusmodi assequenda viam sibi conspiciant esse preclusam, a doctrina litterarum se retrahent et efficiuntur inopes et multiplicabuntur latrones insignes, peribit pro parte maxima scientia litterarum, precipue iuris civilis, artium liberalium, philosophic naturalis, et etiam medicine, et in ecclesia Dei proculdubio subsequenter ydoneorum raritas mtnistrorum...

may have had a hearing at Rome,<sup>23</sup> the chief influence in shaping Boniface's decision to take some of the sting out of *Licet canon* clearly was that of Durandus the Elder, canonist and Bishop of Mende in the south of France. A friend of Boniface, whom he had known when both worked in the papal service, Durandus was persuaded out of retirement to take over the rectorship of the Romagna once again in the first year of Boniface's pontificate, shortly after the letter to the University of Bologna in which Boniface commissioned the compilation of a *Sextus Liber Decretalium*.<sup>23a</sup> With such an eminent canonist within reach, it is unlikely that Boniface went ahead with his own contributions to, or suggestions for, the new compilation, without now and then drawing on Durandus before the latter's death in Rome, 1 December 1296. Indeed, it is not impossible to think that Durandus's commentary on the Lyons and Gregorian constitutions may have been written during or shortly before this return to the Romagna,<sup>24</sup> perhaps even at the request of Boniface himself. At all events, Boniface must have had the canonist's comments on *Licet canon* before him when framing his emendations, for there are distinct echoes of his criticisms in Boniface's constitution *Cum ex eo* which appeared some eighteen months after Durandus's death. Promulgated in the *Liber Sextus* on 3 March 1298, this constitution is so important, and yet so neglected by historians, that we may repeat it here in full.

Cum ex eo quod felicis recordationis Gregorius Papa X praedecessor noster statuit in concilio Lugdunensi ut ad regimen parochialium ecclesiarum as-

<sup>23</sup> Perhaps there was one from the bishop of Langres, to whom Boniface wrote in October 1295 dispensing forty clerics who wished to study from the reception of sacred orders for five years: Tuis igitur supplicationibus inclinati, ut cum quadraginta ex eisdem clericis qui sunt dociles et habeant animum ad studendum et ecclesiastica beneficia obtineant vel etiam obtinebunt, etiam si cura animarum eis immineat, dispensare valeas quod usque ad quinquennium sacros ordines suscipere minime teneantur, et ad id compelli non possint inviti, constitutione contraria non obstante, auctoritate presencium indulgemus, proviso quod interim huiusmodi beneficia debitis obsequiis non fraudentur, et animarum cura in eis si quae illis iminet nullatenus negligatur. Si vero ultra naturam huiusmodi cum aliquibus dispensare forte presumpseris, volumus quod dispensatio huiusmodi sit irrita et inanis, et quod tu ex nunc ipso facto excommunicationis sententiam incurras... (Archivio Segreto Vaticano, Reg. Vat. 47, fol. 123<sup>v</sup>-124<sup>r</sup>).

<sup>23a</sup> On the friendship of Durandus and Boniface, see V. Le Clercq, 'G. Duranti,' *Histoire Littéraire de la France* 20 (1842), 421-422; and on the preparation of the *Sext*, A. Tardif, *Histoire des sources de droit canonique* (Paris, 1887) 207-212, S. Silvia, *Bonifazio VIII* (Rome, 1949) 290.

<sup>24</sup> Certainly after 1289-1291: see L. Falletti, 'Guillaume Durand', *Dictionnaire de droit canonique*, V, 1053.



sumpti se ad sacerdotium promoveri faciant infra annum a sibi commissi regiminis tempore connumerandum et personaliter resideant in eisdem, alioquin, si infra idem tempus promoti non fuerint, huiusmodi ecclesiis absque monitione alia sint privati, nonnullis ex tunc parochiales ecclesias recusantibus acceptare, legendi et proficiendi, cum eis facultates non suppetant, nec ab ecclesiarum praelatis de aliis beneficiis in plerisque mundi partibus interdum provideatur eisdem, opportunitas sit sublata in grande universalis ecclesiae, quae ad sui regimen viris literatis permaxime noscitur indigere, dispendium et iacturam: nos, super hoc multorum instantia excitati frequenter, volentes cupientibus in scientia proficere, ut fructum in Dei ecclesia suo tempore afferre valeant opportunum, utiliter providere, praesenti constitutione sancimus, ut episcopi eorumque superiores cum his, qui huiusmodi subiectas sibi ecclesias obtinent vel obtinuerint, in futurum dispensare possint libere, quod usque ad septennium literarum studio insistentes promoveri minime teneantur, nisi ad ordinem subdiaconatus dumtaxat, ad quem infra praedictum annum recipiendum, (ne, sicut a multis de Christi patrimonio sublimatis olim factum esse dignoscitur, a statu retrocedere valeant clericali) omnino adstringi volumus, et, nisi receperint, poena contenta in dicto concilio eo ipso percelli. Porro septennio praedicto durante iidem episcopi et superiores sollicitè providere procurent, ut per bonos et sufficientes vicarios, ab eis in huiusmodi ecclesiis deputandos, animarum cura diligenter exerceatur, et deserviat laudabiliter in divinis, quibus de ipsarum ecclesiarum proventibus necessaria congrue ministrentur. Elapso vero dicto septennio hi, cum quibus fuerit tu praemittitur, dispensatum, ad diaconatus et presbyteratus ordines infra annum se faciant promoveri, alioquin ex tunc dictam poenam, nisi iusta de causa id omiserint, ipso iure se noverint incursumos.<sup>25</sup>

## II

In virtue of this constitution *Cum ex eo*, bishops were now at liberty to grant leave of absence for study to the parochial clergy, provided that these proceeded to the subdiaconate within a year of institution, and to the diaconate and priesthood within a year of the termination of the

<sup>25</sup> Sext, 1.6,34. The text given here is that of Friedberg in *CIC*, where the opening words are "*Quum ex eo*;" however, the constitution is always quoted in papal and episcopal registers as "*Cum ex eo*." — It has been noted above that the English bishops failed to send their letter of representation to the Pope. Yet it is quite possible that Pecham himself intervened personally with the Papacy (parati sumus et nos scribendo et interpellando vobis assistere in hac parte, he had assured the clergy at Reading), and that Boniface, some seventeen or eighteen years later, was aware of the English viewpoint on *Licet canon*. For although all of the mitigations suggested by Pecham and by the draft letter are not to be found in *Cum ex eo*, e.g., that the age for admission to the cure of souls be changed, yet Pecham's main contention, that those released for study need not become priests within a year of institution, is fully covered; indeed, as in the case of Durandus and *Cum ex eo*, the general approach of Boniface is much the same as that of Pecham and the Reading letter.

licence, and that suitable priests took over the running of their parishes while they were away at a university; in the meantime those absent for purposes of study were to have complete and juridical access to the revenues of their parishes, using them to pay for their studies and upkeep at the university, on condition that the substitutes received a fair and decent share of the parish revenues.

*Cum ex eo* was thus a considerable advance on *Licet canon*; indeed, as Joannes Monachus, the famous canonist and a cardinal in Boniface's curia, remarked, *Cum ex eo* not only modified *Licet canon* but also corrected it in part.<sup>26</sup> Unlike the Gregorian constitution, that of Boniface VIII did not ignore or overlook a practice which bishops before 1274 had rightly fostered on their own; rather it revived and encouraged it. Where the Gregorian constitution was unbending and at a remove from reality in its efforts to suppress absenteeism, *Cum ex eo* was all that Durandus, paraphrasing the *Decretum*, had demanded of a law in his comments on *Licet canon*: that in ordaining something that is necessary for, and beneficial to, the common good, one should also take the circumstances of place and time into account.<sup>27</sup> In legislating ruthlessly against absenteeism, *Licet canon* had in fact placed the common good in jeopardy; *Cum ex eo*, on the other hand, acknowledged that owing to the lack of educational facilities the Church had to countenance some form of non-residence if a supply of educated priests was to be maintained for parochial work. But there was no sacrifice of the principles and the spirit of *Licet canon*, nor of its harsh penalties for absenteeism pure and simple. In *Licet canon* Gregory had made two notable changes in the legislation of III Lateran on residence and ordination: according to III Lateran deprivation for non-residence could not take place without a warning, and for failure to be ordained priest within the specified time, only after judicial trial; Gregory, however, made deprivation *ipso facto* in both cases.<sup>28</sup> Now, while legislating with more realism than Gregory, Boniface VIII still retained his predecessor's approach to malignant absenteeism, making any transgression of the chief conditions in *Cum ex eo* result in deprivation *ipso facto*. Boniface in no way annulled *Licet canon* or turned a blind eye to absenteeism; rather he defined that absence for study was not only a 'reasonable cause'

<sup>26</sup> In *Sextum Librum Decretalium Glossa Aurea* (Venice, 1585), p. 105\*.

<sup>27</sup> Debit ergo lex loco et tempori esse conveniens, necessaria et utilis, et pro communi utilitate conscripta, ut iiii dist., c. erit (*Commentarius*, fol. 46\*).

<sup>28</sup> See H. J. Schroeder, O. P., *Disciplinary Decrees of the General Councils* (New York, 1937) 343.

for non-residence, but also one which was to be conceded liberally, without fear of conniving at absenteeism. A timely and realistic measure, *Cum ex eo* bears the marks of a pope who, stormy and intransigent as history tends to see him, was withal a shrewd canonist. No doubt the constitution was open to abuse,<sup>29</sup> but the three conditions upon which the validity of a licence rested, substitutes, subdiaconate and priesthood, were nicely-set traps for the insincere applicant. Placing his trust in the good-will of prelates, Boniface had seized an opportunity which *Licet canon* had overlooked, and no earlier papal constitution had considered, to exploit the universities in favour of the *cura animarum*.

To a large extent, of course, *Cum ex eo* appears to be merely an extension of Honorius III's *Super specula* to the parochial clergy. The terms are, indeed, to some extent the same, but in fact *Cum ex eo* has nothing to do with *Super specula* as such, nor did it replace or revise it.<sup>29a</sup> The rector or vicar who was released under *Cum ex eo* for studies at a university derived his privileges from that constitution directly and from that alone. If he enjoyed the revenues of his parish, this was in virtue of *Cum ex eo* and not by favour of any other papal constitution or of any privilege granted by papal decree to the university in question. On the other hand, a cleric released in accordance with *Super specula* could not as such benefit from any of the terms of *Cum ex eo*. Boniface's constitution was not designed to provide teachers of theology, or to cater to canons or other beneficed clergy; its purpose was to promote a literate parochial clergy directly, and its application was strictly confined to clerics who were destined for an ordinary and unencumbered *cura animarum*. In fact a dispensation *Cum ex eo*, on the ordinary authority of a diocesan bishop, could only be granted to a simple rector or vicar, that is, to a man of one living only; and that living had to have a *cura animarum*. From cases which reached the papal curia in the fifty years following Boniface's constitution, it seems clear that rectors or vicars

<sup>29</sup> Thus in April 1317 a licence for seven years' study was given to Adam Ayremin of York (*The Register of William Greenfield*, ed. W. A. Brown and A. H. Thompson (York, Surtees Society, 1931-40), V, 256), yet two years later we find him, now a Master, in the King's service in his native Yorkshire (*Calendar of the Close Rolls of the Reign of Edward II* (London 1894), III, 130. But even here it is possible that an ordinary papal dispensation for absence on royal service had been negotiated meanwhile.

<sup>29a</sup> A. F. Sokolich, *Canonical provisions for Universities and Colleges* (Washington, 1956) 25, misses the point of *Cum ex eo* when he writes, "when a period of seven years became necessary for encompassing the courses required for a doctorate, Boniface VIII granted to bishops the faculty of dispensing clerics from the law of residence for those years, and insisted on material support for such students."

who were not wedded directly and exclusively to a single cure of souls could not qualify for a *Cum ex eo* licence: pluralists,<sup>30</sup> for example, rectors of churches without a *cura animarum*,<sup>31</sup> rectors of churches canonically united,<sup>32</sup> rectors of churches with annexed parishes.<sup>33</sup> Likewise, if a rector already had a dispensation from some impediment, his release for study with a licence *Cum ex eo* was outside his bishop's jurisdiction. Normally a condition of personal residence was imposed on one who applied for a dispensation from an impediment in order to take on a *cura animarum*; and no one but the Pope or his delegate could mitigate that condition. For example, Reginald de Sancto Apostolo of the diocese of Exeter was dispensed by the Pope from illegitimacy, and then after institution to a living obtained a *Cum ex eo* licence from his bishop. Later, after his studies were completed, his attention was drawn to the fact that his licence had been illegal, since he had broken a condition of his dispensation from illegitimacy by residing outside his *cura animarum*; he was forced on that account to apply to Pope Clement V for habilitation in 1305.<sup>34</sup>

It seems clear, too, that *Cum ex eo* dispensations from residence were not to be granted to any and every 'simple' rector. The constitution, in fact, presumes that incumbents to whom licences were granted were not yet subdeacons. For it was designed to offer facilities for education to promising young men who might otherwise have been lost to the *cura animarum*. If the prospect of an education at the expense of a parish would make the parochial life more attractive, the obligation of

<sup>30</sup> Archivio Segreto Vaticano, Reg. Vat., 61, fol. 4<sup>v</sup>: Auch diocese; Reg. Vat., 59, fol. 17<sup>v</sup>: Lausanne diocese.

<sup>31</sup> Reg. Vat., 80, fol. 156<sup>v</sup>: Pisa.

<sup>32</sup> Reg. Vat., 57, fol. 237<sup>r</sup>: Auch.

<sup>33</sup> Reg. Vat., 60, fol. 75<sup>r</sup>: Agen.

<sup>34</sup> Reg. Vat. 52, fol. 16<sup>v</sup> (cf. *Calendar of Papal Letters*, II, 3); for a similar case from London see Reg. Vat. 60, fol. 241<sup>r</sup> (*ibid.*, 116). The *Calendar of Papal Letters*, ed. W. H. Bliss, etc. (London, 1894) and the *Calendar of Petitions to the Pope I*, (London, 1896), either through omission or a failure to appreciate the full import of a letter or a petition, sometimes misrepresent cases which deal with licences to study. For example, the *Calendar of Papal Letters*, II, 238 shows Pope John XXII giving a licence for 5 years' study on *Cum ex eo* terms to a rector of Maidstone, Kent (Reg. Vat. 77, fol. 44<sup>r</sup>, n. 1134), but fails to note the next letter (n. 1135) in which the same rector emerges as a canon of Paris at the time of the licence, thus allowing us to understand why he should have had to have recourse to the Pope for his licence. There was, of course, nothing to prevent the Pope giving a *Cum ex eo* licence directly (see, for example, the case of a Rouen rector: *qui est in diaconatus ordine constitutus*, in Reg. Vat. 65, fol. 272<sup>v</sup>), but generally it will be found that rectors who apply to the Pope for their licences do so either because they have friends in the curia, or because they are not technically "simple" rectors.

taking the subdiaconate within a year, thus binding them to the clerical state, would put off all but the most sincere applicants;<sup>34a</sup> further, the condition of ordination to the priesthood within a year of the termination of their studies, would deter those who might hope to go on collecting degrees at the expense of their parish without incurring the disadvantages and responsibilities of the *cura animarum*.

In fact, *Cum ex eo* so obviously catered to the young and the uncommitted that bishops seem to have felt that they were not obliged to grant full *Cum ex eo* dispensations to rectors or vicars who were already subdeacons, deacons or priests. Thus, when a rector of the diocese of Lincoln was instituted to a living he did not obey *Licet canon* and become a priest within a year; instead, he took only the subdiaconate and then negotiated a licence *Cum ex eo* from his bishop, who, however, did not grant the usual permission not to proceed to further orders until the completion of his studies. As it happened, the rector ignored this restriction, continuing to the end of his studies as though he had a full *Cum ex eo* licence. What is interesting is that when the rector later sought permission from Pope Clement V to retain his benefice, his precise crime was not that he had failed to observē *Licet canon* after institution, but that he had not accepted his bishop's refusal to give him a full *Cum ex eo* licence ('et quod ad illos ordines recipiendos minime tenereris tibi dictus episcopus minime non concessit').<sup>35</sup>

As the origins and limitations of the constitution suggest, *Cum ex eo* was meant to attract young and fresh clerics who were not yet subdeacons to the ranks of the parochial clergy. It is, then, a mistake to think that full licences were granted readily, or at all, to rectors who were priests at institution or had exercised the *cura animarum* for some time. It is even more a mistake to imagine that rectors 'wearied with the tedium of medieval village life, doubtless saw in a so-called study-licence an opportunity for a pleasant stay in a university or cathedral city'.<sup>36</sup> This, as we shall see in detail later, is to misunderstand the nature and the applicability of the constitution. For normally rectors or vicars who were given *Cum ex eo* licences were not 'parish' priests, or priests in

<sup>34a</sup> As Boniface put it in *Cum ex eo*: ne, sicut a multis de Christi patrimonio sublimatis olim factum esse dignoscitur, a statu retrocedere valeant clericali.

<sup>35</sup> Reg. Vat. 54, fol. 28<sup>r</sup>. The *Calendar* again gives an inadequate summary of the case: "licence to retain that church, he being in subdeacon's orders, and having received permission from John, bishop of Lincoln, to continue his studies for three years" (*Cal. Pap. Letters*, II, 23).

<sup>36</sup> C. J. Godfrey, 'Non-residence of parochial clergy in the fourteenth century,' *Church Quarterly Review*, 162 (1961) 436.

any capacity, at the time of the granting of a licence. In fact, those for whom the constitution was designed were, by some sort of juridical fiction, rectors only in name.<sup>37</sup> Nor were they really 'deserting' their parishes or 'having the best of both worlds'. Since these '*Cum ex eo*' rectors were presumed by the constitution not to be subdeacons at the time of the granting of the licence, they could not, in any case, have engaged in the full *cura animarum* for some time. In fact, since they did not have to become priests until a year after the end of their studies, they could be admitted to a living as early as the age of twenty one, a year, that is, before the canonical age for the subdiaconate, and some four years short of the age required for the priesthood. Strictly speaking, a rector was supposed to be twenty five years of age at least at institution, according to III Lateran and *Licet canon*, but here again there was a legal fiction in the broader interests of the *cura animarum*. The primary end of *Cum ex eo* (and of Pecham's proposals at Reading in 1279) was to provide opportunities of education for the parochial clergy *before* ordination to the priesthood and *before* they shouldered the full burden of the pastoral care; and this was to be achieved by allowing likely young clerics to be rectors juridically but not in practice so that their parishes could pay for their course of studies. The admission of a young man of twenty one to a parish church on the understanding that he was to be released for studies did not really transgress *Licet canon*, nor did it nullify his institution. Such a rector was, so to speak, canonically committed to, but dispensed *ipso iure* from, the exercise of the *cura animarum* until a course of studies had brought him up to the standard demanded by *Licet canon* of those to whom the *regimen animarum* was entrusted. It is therefore very interesting to note how soon after institution *Cum ex eo* licences were granted. More often than not, in the full spirit of Boniface's legislation, licences follow closely on the institution of clerics who are not yet subdeacons.<sup>37a</sup>

<sup>37</sup> See the remarks of J. Absil, 'L'absentéisme du clergé paroissial au diocèse de Liège au xv<sup>e</sup> s. et dans la première moitié du xv<sup>e</sup> s.,' *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique*, 57 (1962) 41-2.

<sup>37a</sup> Joannes Andreae, in his gloss on the Sext, holds that when Boniface imposes a condition of ordination to the subdiaconate he is not thereby implying that clerics in minor orders are to be admitted to parish churches, but is rather thinking only of those who have had a dispensation from the law forbidding the institution to parish churches of clerics who are in minor orders. Here Joannes contradicts the more common opinion which held, as did the great canonists Joannes Monachus and Guido de Baysio, that after this constitution *Cum ex eo*: sine dispensatione de iure communi potest in minoribus constitutus eligi ad parochialem ecclesiam. (see *Liber Sextus, Decretalium Domini Bonifatii Papae Octavi suae integritati una cum Clementinis et Extravagantibus earumque glossis restitutus* (Venice, 1584),

A parish, then, was not really deprived of the services of a seasoned parish priest for periods up to seven years, if, as seems to be the general case, the ideal behind *Cum ex eo* was perceived by bishops who granted licences. Rather, in paying for the education of its absent 'rector', the parish was simply investing in its own future, and on terms which practically insured it against losses. As we shall see presently, the care with which those conditions were observed, and the extent to which licences *Cum ex eo* were granted, show clearly how appreciative bishops and clergy alike were of the purpose, timeliness and wisdom of Boniface's constitution. For Boniface, in fact, had proposed a solution to the problem of the education of the parochial clergy which would not be improved upon in practice until the Council of Trent some two and a half centuries later.<sup>38</sup>

### III

Unlike the Trent legislation on seminaries, *Cum ex eo* does not specify what studies were to be followed, nor does it impose a condition that some at least of the licence should be spent in the study of canon law or theology. This, in fact, is probably the weakest point in the constitution, for one would have expected some mention of studies which would prepare rectors for the *cura animarum* as such, and for the priesthood. In this connection it is of interest to note that the letter drawn up under Pecham's guidance at Reading in 1279 was more concerned about a liberal education for those engaged in the pastoral care than about studies which would be of more direct benefit to the *cura animarum*. If *Licet canon* were not revised, it said: *peribit pro parte maxima scientia litterarum, precipue iuris civilis, artium liberalium, philosophiae naturalis et etiam medicine, et in ecclesia Dei proculdubio erit subsequenter ydoneorum raritas ministrorum*.<sup>39</sup>

The ideal thing, of course, would have been a combination of a study of the liberal arts and some sort of direct preparation for the priesthood, but Boniface, thinking perhaps to make the *cura animarum* more attractive, left those who enjoyed *Cum ex eo* licences free to make their own

col. 164, v. *subdiaconatus*). The common opinion is the one followed here. It seems to agree more with the preamble to Boniface's "declaratio" of *Licet canon*, and is certainly borne out by the practice of the bishops.

<sup>38</sup> It is therefore a little surprising not to find a mention of *Cum ex eo* in J. A. O'Donohue's *Tridentine Seminary Legislation; Its sources and its formation* (Louvain, 1957), which does discuss *Super specula* at pp. 13-14 and pp. 106-7.

<sup>39</sup> See n. 22, above.

choice of studies. The type of cleric for which Boniface was legislating, and on whose behalf the Reading letter was written, was one who would have been lost to the *cura animarum* had there been no facilities for education at his disposal. It could be presumed that he would not waste his time, and that at the end of his licence he would at least have some sort of formation and a general background. At all events, the rector who had obtained a *Cum ex eo* licence would not be totally illiterate before ordination and before taking over the full *cura animarum*.

However, a *Cum ex eo* licence on the ordinary authority of a bishop did not immediately grant permission to study any and every subject, or indeed all of the subjects listed in the Reading letter, but only those which were not barred in any way by ecclesiastical law. For example, if a rector wished to use a *Cum ex eo* licence for the study of civil law, he had first to have a papal dispensation, since Honorius III had forbidden any cleric who had a *personatus* or a *cura animarum* to frequent the civil law schools.<sup>40</sup> Thus in 1313 Clement V was petitioned by the Archbishop of Bordeaux for faculties to dispense a rector for seven years' study of civil law;<sup>41</sup> in 1326 John XXII gave a three-year dispensation to a perpetual vicar;<sup>42</sup> while Benedict XII gave part of a year in 1338, and a full year in 1339, to a rector of the diocese of Cahors.<sup>43</sup>

When a licence was granted by a bishop for legitimate study,<sup>43a</sup> the maximum time allowed was seven years. Any time over and above this period was outside the jurisdiction of the licensing bishop. If a rector

<sup>40</sup> X. 3.50,10. The prohibition, which is part of the decretal letter *Super specula* of Honorius III, was designed to promote the study of theology: quia theologiae studium cupimus ampliari. On this, and on the prohibition of the teaching and study of civil law at Paris in the same decretal, see S. Kuttner, 'Papst Honorius III und das Studium des Zivilrechts,' *Festschrift für Martin Wolff*, ed. F. M. Cammerer, etc. (Tübingen, 1952) 79-101.

<sup>41</sup> Reg. Vat. 60, fol. 163<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>42</sup> Reg. Vat. 80., fol. 243.

<sup>43</sup> Reg. Av. 85, fol. 414<sup>r</sup> (1338), Reg. Vat. 127, fol. 352<sup>r</sup> (1339). For some other cases see Reg. Vat. 55, fol. 83<sup>r</sup> (Lichfield rector had seven years *Cum ex eo*; now he gets three more for civil law from Clement V); *ibid.*, fol. 29<sup>r</sup> (diocese of Braga); Reg. Vat. 60, fol. 163<sup>r</sup> (diocese of Bordeaux).

<sup>43a</sup> Joannes Andreae, in his gloss on the Sext, would include civil law as a legitimate subject: *Litterarum*: cum non distinguat, intelligo generaliter, sive in grammatica, sive in iure canonico, vel civili, vel scientia theologiae studeat (*Liber Sextus*, (Venice, 1584), col. 164). He does not state whether the usual papal dispensation would have to be sought first. Very few bishops appear to have acted on the assumption that "letters" or "scholastic disciplines" automatically included a dispensation to attend the civil law schools.



desired to continue his studies after those seven years were up, and to enjoy the privileges conferred by *Cum ex eo*, then he had to have recourse to the Pope. Thus the case of Ralph Ingham of Dean West in the diocese of Salisbury, who, by 1325, had exhausted a seven-year licence which he had from Bishop Mortival. Because he had developed an interest in civil law and now wished to study it more scientifically, he petitioned John XXII for an extension and was granted an extra two years with *Cum ex eo* privileges.<sup>44</sup> For the same reason a rector in the diocese of Lichfield successfully petitioned Clement V in 1308 for a three-year extension of a seven-year episcopal licence.<sup>45</sup> In all cases, however, where an extension of *Cum ex eo* was sought from the Pope, the petition had to be careful to state when the licence had ended, and whether all the conditions of *Cum ex eo* had been fulfilled. Thus when Master John de Sutton, rector of Tinford, Lincs., asked for and obtained a three-year extension, he noted that he had become a subdeacon within a year of the granting of the licence, as demanded by *Cum ex eo*, but that he had not yet proceeded to further orders after the end of his seven-year licence, since the year was not yet up within which he should have been ordained deacon and priest.<sup>46</sup>

<sup>44</sup> Reg. Vat. 80, fol. 27<sup>r</sup> (cf. *Cal. Pap. Letters*, II, 246).

<sup>45</sup> Reg. Vat. 55, fol. 83<sup>v</sup> (cf. *Cal. Pap. Letters*, II, 39). For some other examples of papal extensions of *Cum ex eo* licences granted "on the ordinary authority" of bishops, see, for John XXII's pontificate, Reg. Vat. 55, fol. 135<sup>r</sup> (five years extra to a rector of d. Rodez), 56, fol. 14<sup>r</sup> (seven years to rector of d. Agen), fol. 31<sup>r</sup> (three years to another rector of d. Agen), 59, fol. 122<sup>r</sup> (seven years to rector d. Auch), 60, fol. 248<sup>r</sup> (three years to rector of d. Cahors), etc. In Reg. Vat. 168, fol. 190<sup>v</sup>, Master Walter de Wodhous, rector of Kippax, Yorks., asks for a seven-year extension, for civil law studies at Bologna, of a seven-years *Cum ex eo* licence, but is only granted three years by Pope Clement VI (1345); here again, the *Cal. Pap. Petitions* I, 98 renders the petition incompletely, while *Cal. Pap. Letters* renders the grace inadequately (III, 187); neither mentions that Walter has already had seven years from his bishop.

<sup>46</sup> ... episcopus Lincolniensis tecum cupienti in scientia proficere... iuxta constitutionem felicitis recordacionis Bonifacii VIII predecessoris nostri super hoc editam, post cuius edicionem illam assequens te fecisti iuxta tenorem ipsius infra annum in subdiaconatum ordinari, per septennium litterarum studio licite insistere posses, cum auctoritate constitutionis huius dispensavit; tuque per idem septem prefato studio institisti, te non faciens quamquam huius sit elapsum sic septennium, cum nondum alius annus in constitutione prefata contentus effluerit, ad ultiores ordines promoveri. Quare, cum adhuc huiusmodi studio cupias sicut asseris immorari, fuit pro parte tua nobis humiliter supplicatum... (Reg. Vat. 54, fol. 96<sup>r</sup>; cf. *Cal. Pap. Letters*, I, 29). This request was made through Cardinal Thomas Jorz, O. P., whose kinsman Sutton was; as it happened, he did not devote himself to study during the three years' extra licence: see Reg. Vat. 59, fol. 140<sup>v</sup>-1<sup>r</sup>; *Cal. Pap. Letters*, II, 98. Another case comes from Rouen, where a rector states when applying for an extension that his seven-year licence has not yet ended; when Clement V gives him two years more, these are to begin: finito dicto septennio (Reg. Vat. 63, fol. 390<sup>v</sup>).

Apart from papal dispensations, the maximum absence of seven years allowed by *Cum ex eo* was with reference to the *cura animarum* as such and not to a particular living. A change of parish would not affect the issue and give a rector a fresh start,<sup>46a</sup> nor would a change of diocese. Rectors could not go around collecting licences, as Roger de Mortuomari found when he was forced to seek habilitation from John XXII in 1327 because he had enjoyed two maximum licences, one from the Bishop of Hereford when rector of Richard's Castle in that diocese, a second when he resigned that living at the end of the first licence and became rector of Staunton in the diocese of Ely.<sup>47</sup> But once a true and legitimate licence had been granted, it could not be withdrawn except for a very grave reason; and new bishops had to respect licences given by their predecessors.<sup>48</sup> Licences granted during a vacancy in a see are not common, but the *custos spiritualitatum* nevertheless had the power; we may instance a seven-year licence granted from York in 1317 during the vacancy on the death of Archbishop Greenfield.<sup>49</sup> But if a bishop were merely absent, then his vicar could neither dispense for studies nor withdraw a licence, unless the power had been delegated expressly by the bishop. Thus when Anthony Bek was away from Durham on one occasion, his vicar general took it upon himself to grant a seven-year licence; as a result the luckless rector later had to have recourse to Clement V for a dispensation to retain his living.<sup>50</sup>

<sup>46a</sup> Quid si pendente dispensatione mecum facta de isto septennio, assumor ad aliam parochialem ecclesiam sine fraude, numquid adhuc poterit in septennio mecum dispensari? Et satis videtur quod non, per hanc litteram, cum videatur tempus inspicere ratione personae, et secundum hoc, et per ea quae dixi in principio glossae, videtur quod tempus istud incipiat a tempore dispensationis...: Joannes Andreae in v. *septennium* (*Liber Sextus*, Venice, 1584, col. 164).

<sup>47</sup> Reg. Vat. 85, fol. 246 (*Cal. Pap. Letters*, II, 261-2, but inaccurately rendered). Incidentally, Roger was only 14 years of age when he was given his first licence; he was just 22 (about the correct age for a first licence) when he received his second. Another interesting case of a change of diocese will be found in Reg. Vat. 162, fol. 84<sup>r</sup>, in 1343.

<sup>48</sup> On this and other points connected with *Cum ex eo* see Oldradus de Ponte Laudensis, (ob. 1335), *Consilia seu Responsa et Quaestiones Aureae*, ed. Rainaldus Corso (Venice, 1685), fol. 104. See also the two *Cum ex eo* cases discussed in the early 14th century at Toulouse University in *Responsa Doctorum Tholosanorum*, ed. E. M. Meijers (Haarlem, 1938), pp. 112-114.

<sup>49</sup> Reg. Greenfield, V, p. 256; see the case discussed in the *Consilia* of Federico Petrucci of Siena, composed between 1334 and 1338: Quaestio est ista: an capitulum sede vacante possit cum rectore parochialis ecclesiae dispensare ut per septennium insistere valeat studio litterarum quin ad sacerdotium promoveri minime teneatur (*Consilia* (Venice, 1587), cons. 38).

<sup>50</sup> Reg. Vat. 58, fol. 237<sup>r</sup>: ...quidam eius vicarius generalis in dicta diocesi tecum ut insistens studio litterarum non teneris inde ad septennium ratione ipsius ecclesie nisi ad

If bishops and *sede vacante* vicars had to respect licences already in existence, they could, nevertheless, take steps to see that the conditions upon which the licence had been granted were being fulfilled. This was the duty as well as the right of any ordinary who gave a licence or countenanced one already granted. It is incorrect to think that 'bishops appear to have had no means of finding out whether the rector diligently pursued his studies or merely enjoyed a holiday.'<sup>51</sup> On occasion, indeed, university authorities were called upon to furnish testimonials to the quality and progress of a rector. When calumnious rumours were circulating about a certain rector whom Hamo of Hethe, bishop of Rochester, had released under *Cum ex eo* for studies at Oxford, two successive chancellors of the university, Henry Gower in 1325 and William Alberwik in 1326, gave testimony to Hethe that the rector in question had spent his time continuously and profitably in study.<sup>52</sup> In 1323, when Bishop Drovensford of Bath and Wells had heard that some licensed rectors were resorting to London instead of to places of study, he commissioned his official to examine all those who had been dispensed on the state of their studies, and to recall all licences which were found to have been abused.<sup>53</sup>

This episcopal watchfulness was necessary, not only in order to curtail abuses of *Cum ex eo* and of parish revenues, but also in order to protect

subdiaconatus tantum ordines promoveri, iuxta constitutionem felicitis recordacionis Bonifacii VIII predecessoris nostri super hoc editam, dispensavit, quamvis super hoc nullam specialem haberet ab eodem episcopo potestatem... (cf. *Cal. Pap. Letters*, II, 91, which misses the point of the letter). To add to the difficulty of his position the rector had only studied fitfully: cuius dispensacionis pretextu eidem studio non continuis, prout secundum constitutionem tenebaris eandem, sed interruptis temporibus institisti...

<sup>51</sup> E. H. Pearce, *Thomas de Cobham, Bishop of Worcester (1317-1327)* (London, 1923) 101.

<sup>52</sup> *Registrum Hamonis de Hethe Diocesis Roffensis 1319-1322*, ed. C. Johnson (Cant. and York Soc., 1948), 173/74, 177: Testimonium conversacionis et studii. Universis presentes litteras inspecturis, Henricus de Gower, cancellarius universitatis Oxoniensis, salutem in domino sempiternam. Noverit universitas vestra dominum Johannem de Westbrok, scolarem nostrum, rectorem ecclesie de Northcreye Roffensis diocesis, in universitate nostra debitis studenti temporibus commorando et literarum studio jugiter insistendo a festo purificationis beate Marie anno domini millesimo tercentesimo vicesimo primo usque ad xiiij kalendas julii anno domini millesimo tercentesimo vicesimo tercio, se ita bene et laudabiliter habuisse quod testimonio laudabili merito debeat commendari, prout in magno parte per propriam noticiam ac eciam per... testes fidedignos, juratos, examinatos et ad hoc coram nobis judicialiter vocatos recepimus plenam fidem (pp. 173-4). The same testimony was repeated on 2 August 1325; ne insidiantium invidia vel calumpniantium ora maliciose captata status ejusdem alicui posset in dubium revocari (p. 174). On 17 July 1326 William de Alberick testified for the period 3 October 1325-17 July 1326 (p. 177).

<sup>53</sup> *The Register of John de Drovensforde, Bishop of Bath and Wells, 1320-1329*, ed. E. Hobbhouse, (Somerset Record Society, 1887) 227.

the absent incumbent. For if bishops were open to reprimand for granting licences recklessly or to the unworthy,<sup>54</sup> incumbents would lose their licences and would be held to have defrauded their parishes, when they in any way departed from the terms of their *Cum ex eo* licence.<sup>54a</sup> Besides, bishops had to be careful that the spirit as well as the letter of Boniface's constitution was preserved. Writing just as the Black Death was beginning to take a grip on England, the Dominican moral theologian John Bromyard complained that many of the parochial clergy were frittering their licences away at the universities, making a mockery of Boniface's great constitution. If they did not devote themselves manfully to their studies, then they were vitiating the purpose of the constitution.<sup>55</sup> In his opinion there was no reason why they should remain

<sup>54</sup> See, for example, a letter drawn up by Benedict XII in 1337 in reproof of the bishop of Soissons (Reg. Vat. 124, fol. 210<sup>v</sup>). He had had a complaint from one of the bishop's archdeacons: quod tu rectoribus et capellanis curatis presertim in eius archidiaconatu Brie... minus etiam docilibus studiorum pretextu et aliter contra iura canonica de non residendo personaliter... licencias seu dispensaciones indiscretas et improvidas pro tua libitu concessisti et eas petentibus sine difficultate concedis... Benedict therefore ordered that: licencias seu dispensaciones huiusmodi... contra iura et sine racionabili causa concessas, indilate studeas effectualiter revocare, nullas alias deinceps licencias seu dispensaciones huiusmodi nisi in casibus a iure expressis aliquibus quomodolibet concessuras... Later, the letter was cassated.

<sup>54a</sup> For failure to become a subdeacon within a year of the granting of a licence, and a priest within a year of the termination of the period allowed, the express penalty in *Cum ex eo* was the *ipso facto* deprivation ordered by *Licet canon* for failure to become a priest within a year of institution. Boniface did not annul *Licet canon*. Rather he defined that, for purposes of study, the *Licet canon* obligation of ordination would only come into force after the termination of a licence. However, he replaced the obligation of ordination to the priesthood within a year of institution by the equally effective one of ordination to the subdiaconate.

<sup>55</sup> Et nota quod omnes predictae allegationes multum esse videntur contra illos cum quibus episcopi dispensant quod causa eruditionis scholas exercere poterunt per septennium vel per alium terminum infra septennium contentum: postquam ad ecclesias curam animarum habentes promoti fuerint antequam ad sacerdotium promoveantur, sicut patet libro sexto decretalium, titulo de electione, capitulo cum ex eo: nisi in scholis viriliter addiscent, quia illa est causa finalis quare eis licentia et privilegium de non residendo et ad ordines non promovendo datum est, sicut expresse patet ex illius capituli tenore, in quo prius ostendit quomodo ecclesia viris indiget literatis, et quod magnum damnum ex talium patitur defectu; deinde dat episcopis auctoritatem quod cum volentibus in scientia proficere dispensare poterunt: ut fructum in Dei ecclesia suo tempore afferre valeant opportunum. Ex quo patet quod profectus in scholis causa est quare papa cum eis dispensare voluit de non residentia; nec aliter eis talem dedit licentiam. Illa ergo causa cessante coram Deo iudicantur sine licentia... Licet ergo non ordinati coram mundo titulo dispensationis excusentur, si tamen viriliter non studuerint coram Deo excusati non sunt (*Summa prædicantium* (Paris, 1500), O. iv.17).

on at the universities until they had taken degrees. Once they had obtained a grasp of pastoral theology and the theology of the Incarnation, they should return to their cure of souls and 'glorify God, setting a headline for their fellows by word and example.'<sup>56</sup> Again, the great and liberal bishop of Salisbury, Simon of Ghent (1297-1315) was not always happy about those who applied for licences; some clearly would not derive much benefit from a course of studies. On occasions when he was unsure of the quality of an applicant, he simply granted a trial licence; thus he released a rector who was already a priest for a short term of study with the 'Magister scholarum' at Marlborough on the understanding that he would be considered for a further dispensation 'si interim bene expediat et ad id (studium) se habilem reddat.'<sup>57</sup> As it is, this is not one of the happiest examples of Ghent's circumspection, since in fact he seems to be a little at variance with *Cum ex eo*. For Boniface had clearly specified that the term of study should be spent at a *studium generale*, which Marlborough was not. Indeed, it is only on rare occasions that one finds a licence being granted for study at a *studium particulare* (the status, roughly, of Marlborough); and then only by the Pope.<sup>58</sup> With his well-known zeal for the education of the clergy, Ghent's application of *Cum ex eo* may have been at times more liberal than exact.

By and large Ghent's use of the faculties allowed him by *Cum ex eo* was careful and conscientious, although on occasion he must have felt a little overwhelmed by the eagerness of the parochial clergy. If he was brusque with Thomas of Lichfield, rector of Hinton Martell, who was granted a licence of one year at Christmas 1301 with the proviso 'quod de cetero ea de causa dominum non infestat,'<sup>59</sup> Ghent was over-cautious,

<sup>56</sup> Postquam in scholis didicerint de verbo incarnato: et gregis informatione ad breve tempus audierint, redeant ad gregem suam, et Deum glorificent, fratres suos verbis et exemplis confirmando. Nec expectent usque magistri fiant... (*ibid.*, P. xiii.25).

<sup>57</sup> *Registrum Simonis de Gandavo Episcopi Saresberiensis 1297-1315*, ed. C. T. Flower and M.C.B. Dawes (Canterbury and York Society, 1934), 849.

<sup>58</sup> See Reg. Vat. 57, fol. 117<sup>r</sup>; and the comment of Joannes Andreae: Et habentes dispensationem propter studium, studere debent, non in castris vel villis, sed in studio generali, ut supra de clericis non residentibus, tuae [X. 3.4,13], alias privilegium non habebunt, ut ibi. (*Liber Sextus*, (Venice, 1584), col. 164, in v. *litterarum* of *Cum ex eo*). The usual phrase in papal or episcopal licences is studio litterarum, ubi sollemniter vigeat, or simply studium generale. On the differences between the various types of studia see Hastings Rashdall, *The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages*, ed. F. M. Powicke and A. B. Emden, (Oxford, 1936), I, 6-17, with the later literature reviewed by S. Stelling-Michaud, *XI<sup>e</sup> Congrès International des Sciences Historiques, Rapports*, (Stockholm, 1960), I, 99-100.

<sup>59</sup> Reg. S. de Gandavo, p. 850. In fact, Lichfield turned up again the following Christmas, and wheedled another year out of Ghent (*ibid.*, p. 859).

perhaps, in the case of Alexander Newport, rector of Warfield near Windsor, on the outskirts of the Salisbury diocese. Presented to Warfield on 25 August 1305, Newport, then an acolyte, was instituted to the rectory almost two months later, on 15 October 1305.<sup>60</sup> A few days later, apparently, he left for studies at Oxford, for on 28 May 1306, when he was ordained subdeacon, he was issued a *Cum ex eo* licence for two years' study at Oxford, retrospective to the previous Feast of St. Luke (18 October 1305), three days, that is, after the institution.<sup>61</sup> A week after he had become a subdeacon, however, Newport managed to get this licence increased by three years to a five-year licence, again dated from the same Feast of St. Luke in 1305;<sup>62</sup> and when this licence was nearing its term in October 1310, he exchanged it for a licence of six years from the date of his institution to Warfield.<sup>63</sup> The total six years, a period sufficient for a bachelor's degree at least, therefore came to an end on 15 October 1311, by which date, however, Newport appears not to have taken a degree since he applied for a further leave of absence. Simon of Ghent, on the other hand, seems to have thought that Newport should have taken his degree within the six years already granted, and that there was not sufficient justification for a seventh year with *Cum ex eo* privileges. Instead, perhaps because he did not wish to deprive Newport of the crown of his studies, Ghent had recourse to Gregory X's constitution *Licet canon*, which allowed non-residence for a 'reasonable cause,' and proceeded to allow Newport his extra year on *Licet canon* terms.<sup>64</sup> But he still held that Newport should have completed his studies within the original six-year licence, and that now he was technically bound to become a deacon and a priest within the year after his *Cum ex eo* licence ended. For we find that Newport, despite his additional *Licet canon* licence, obtained letters dimissory for the diaconate on the day before the Ember Saturday of Whitweek in the following May 1312,<sup>65</sup> and for the priesthood in time for the Ember ordinations in September.<sup>66</sup> He

<sup>60</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 659.

<sup>61</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 875.

<sup>62</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 885.

<sup>63</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 896.

<sup>64</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 904. Ghent, in particular, on occasion made use of *Licet canon* rather than *Cum ex eo*, especially where there was a question of releasing a rector who was already a master or a priest (see *Reg.* pp. 905, 911). Sometimes, as in the case of Lavyngton, the last year of study was on a *Licet canon* licence (see *Reg.* p. 913), so that the rector would already be a priest by the time he returned to his parish at the end of his studies.

<sup>65</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 906 (19 May 1312).

<sup>66</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 908 (14 September 1312. The Autumn Ember days fell that year on 20, 22 and 23 September).

would thus have forestalled the anniversary (15 October 1312) of the end of his *Cum ex eo* licence by one month. Had he delayed his ordination to the priesthood until after that date, he would have lost his living *ipso facto*, and like a rector of Swindon in the same diocese in the previous year, would have had to seek papal habilitation before he could regain his rectory at Warfield.<sup>67</sup>

Ghent's refusal to grant the maximum licence immediately was not at all uncommon, for bishops were at liberty to grant the seven years as a whole, or to grant a part only, or to dole them out year by year; many, indeed, proceeded along lines similar to those suggested by a glossator of the Sext: 'imo commendabile est non a principio totum dare septennium ut experiatur si proficient, et tunc detur ulterius tempus: alias denegetur.'<sup>68</sup> But whatever period was granted to a rector, it was valid only for the University or area specified by the bishop,<sup>69</sup> and it had to be spent continuously in study. Even an apparently innocent and unavoidable failure to maintain uninterrupted attendance at a university did not save a rector (or vicar) from legal penalties. Thus when a rector of the diocese of Rodez had to interrupt a seven-year licence in order to accompany his bishop to the Council of Vienne, he was obliged to petition Clement V, asking that the time spent in going to and returning from Vienne would not be held against him.<sup>70</sup> In the same way a Rouen rector had to seek habilitation because 'King's business' had forced him to desert his studies while enjoying a three-year licence.<sup>71</sup> Other breaches of *Cum ex eo* were not quite so innocent. A rector of the diocese of Agen confessed in a petition to Clement that he had spent some of his licence 'following the episcopal curia of the bishop of Toulouse';<sup>72</sup> and when Robert Pincebek, now a canon of Dublin, applied for habilitation in 1315, he stated that when rector of Erpingham

<sup>67</sup> Reg. Vat. 58, fol. 153<sup>v</sup>. The summary in *Cal. Pap. Letters*, II, 68, again misses the point of the letter.

<sup>68</sup> *Liber Sextus*, (Venice, 1584), col. 164, in *v. septennium* of *Cum ex eo*.

<sup>69</sup> Thus a rector of the diocese of Coventry and Lichfield had to seek habilitation from Clement V in 1308 because: *insistendi infra regnum Anglie dumtaxat studio literarum tecum obtinuisti auctoritate ordinaria dispensari, tuque postmodum fere per quinquennium formam huius dispensacionis excedens extra regnum ipsum in regno Francie institisti huiusmodi studio literarum...* (Reg. Vat. 55, fol. 102<sup>r</sup>; *Cal. Pap. Letters*, II, 41, but not accurately summarized).

<sup>70</sup> Reg. Vat. 59, fol. 180<sup>r</sup>. The permission was, it seems, *viva voce*, for later the rector asked for letters to this effect; when Pope Clement gave them he increased the licence by a further five years.

<sup>71</sup> *Ibid.*, fol. 200<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>72</sup> *Ibid.*, fol. 132<sup>v</sup>.

in the diocese of Norwich, he had been granted a seven-year licence, more than two years of which had been spent in the *studium generale* of the Roman curia, but 'not quite in the spirit of *Cum ex eo*.'<sup>73</sup> Again, a rector of the diocese of Lincoln had to supplicate the same Pope because, among other things, 'nullum ex tali dispensatione commodum reportasti.'<sup>74</sup> Finally, in the register of Hamo of Hethe, bishop of Rochester, there is a striking memorandum after the record of institution (12.9.1332) of a rector: *Non apparet de studio continuato... juxta dispensationem sibi factam a tempore institutionis usque ad festum Nativitatis Domini proximo sequens et postea, in anno domini MCCCXXXV, dum in universitate communiter legebatur.*<sup>75</sup>

'Dum communiter legebatur' neatly defines what was meant by continuous study; vacation periods were not taken into account. Sometimes, however, a bishop might make his own conditions about the vacations, as when Simon of Ghent gave a licence to the rector of Chieveley, Berks., in 1307, with the proviso that 'he visited the parish in the Christmas vacation and resided there from the eve of Palm Sunday until the octave of Easter.'<sup>76</sup> If a rector was already a priest, and if, as in the case of Chieveley, the parish was not too far away from the university, then he could be expected to return to his parish sometime during Lent, when the annual obligation of confession in their parish church was being fulfilled by most of his parishioners. Thus Bishop Drokensford of Bath and Wells gave a licence to a priest-rector for one year's study at Oxford, 'ita quod tempore quadragesimali accedat ad ecclesiam suam pro cura sibi commissa visitanda.'<sup>77</sup>

During these licensed absences from the *cura animarum*, the parish would be cared for by the 'competent substitute' demanded by *Cum ex eo*. The responsibility for this 'vicar' rested with the bishop who granted the licence. There was not much point in allowing incumbents to depart their parishes in the hope that they would return better-equipped for the pastoral care, if, in the meantime, the parishes were to lie fallow. Ghent of Salisbury was most careful on this point. Granting a three-year licence to the rector of Blunsden St. Andrew in 1301, he

<sup>73</sup> ... in romana curia, ubi secundum alium dicti predecessoris constitutionem viget studium generale, iuris canonici studio duxeris insistendum, non tamen forsitan et prout predicté super hoc edite constitutiones requirunt effectus eidem studio institisti (Reg. Vat. 59, fol. 115; the *Cal. Pap. Letters*, II, 97, does not include this in its summary).

<sup>74</sup> Reg. Vat. 54, fol. 2<sup>v</sup> (cf. *Cal. Pap. Letters*, II, 22).

<sup>75</sup> *Registrum*, p. 522.

<sup>76</sup> *Reg. S. de Gandavo*, p. 847.

<sup>77</sup> *Register of John Drokensforde*, p. 197.



only allowed the substitute when he had satisfied himself that he was up to the mark.<sup>78</sup> A licence which he granted in 1312/13 was conditional on the provision of a substitute who would have to pass a test to see if he were 'pro cura inibi exercenda sufficiens'.<sup>79</sup>

Many of these substitutes were, no doubt, 'clerical hacks'.<sup>80</sup> But where rectories and vicarages were already provided with an assistant priest, the incumbent simply handed the parish over to his second-in-command. Thus when William of Pagula left his vicarage at Winkfield, Berks., for Oxford in 1314 or 1315, he was not faced with the difficulty of finding a steady substitute. For when Bishop Ghent ordained a perpetual vicarage at Winkfield in 1310, he stipulated that the vicars should provide themselves, from their own resources, with an assistant priest who would fulfill the vicar's functions whenever necessary, and generally assist him.<sup>81</sup> Of course, not all rectories or vicarages were as well-provided for as the vicarage at Winkfield; there the Dean and Chapter of Salisbury were committed to an annual payment of sixty marks a year, no mean sum when it is remembered that the minimum fixed by the Council of Oxford in 1222 was five marks a year, and that the majority of vicarages rarely paid much more than this.<sup>82</sup> A man like William of Pagula could therefore afford to pay his assistant priest considerably more than these insecure clerics were usually vouchsafed,<sup>83</sup> and yet be comfortably secure while away at the university. For with the set income from the Dean and Chapter, he was also entitled to a generous share of the general income of the parish.

When, on occasion, the revenues of a rectory or vicarage were found to be insufficient to cover expenses at a university and to pay for the required substitute, a papal dispensation to hold a second benefice could be sought. Thus Michael de Estona of the diocese of Salisbury,

<sup>78</sup> Et dominus examinavit Iohannem de Norton, capellanum, et quia invenit eum sufficienter litteratum, ipsum admisit... (*Reg. S. de Gandavo*, p. 847).

<sup>79</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 913.

<sup>80</sup> C. J. Godfrey, 'Non-residence of the parochial clergy,' *Church Quarterly Review*, 162 (1961) 443-444.

<sup>81</sup> *Reg. S. de Gandavo*, pp. 512-513.

<sup>82</sup> See J. R. H. Moorman, *Church Life in England in the Thirteenth Century* (Cambridge, 1946), 45-6.

<sup>83</sup> Quinil of Exeter, for example, made four marks a year the minimum payment for assistant priests in his diocese in 1287 (Wilkins, *Concilia*, II, 147). After *Cum ex eo* licences had become a common feature of ecclesiastical life, bishops generally gave a rector who obtained a licence the power to make his own arrangements with his assistant priest; originally the custom had been for the bishop to decide the salary: see *Liber Sextus*, (Venice, 1584), col. 162, reporting a comment of Dominicus de S. Geminiano (ob. 1436).

who already had a *Cum ex eo* licence from his bishop, was given permission by the Pope in 1305 to take another benefice while studying, because: dicte ecclesie de Erchesfonte [Urchfont, Wilts.] redditus et proventus sint adeo tenues et exiles quod ex eis decenter sustentari non potes.<sup>84</sup> A year before this, the same Pope had given John Luttrell, rector of Holin, Yorks., a five-year licence during which he was to have the fruits of his rectory and one other benefice.<sup>85</sup>

Under a normal episcopal licence, however, the revenues of one parish only would be involved; and these were to be used primarily and directly for the expenses of an absence for study. A rector or a vicar could not do exactly as he wished with the fruits of his parish once he had obtained a licence, for the only title he had to these fruits while absent was *studio litterarum*. For example, he was not entitled thereby to farm them out, without first negotiating a dispensation from the law of the church on farming.<sup>86</sup> But if he made proper use of these revenues, and obeyed *Cum ex eo* to the letter, his rights to the fruits of his living could not be impeded in any way while he was absent; and whenever he experienced any difficulty in obtaining these revenues, he could appeal in all confidence for a papal mandate to ensure that they were not withheld from him or diverted to some other purpose,<sup>87</sup> knowing that access to parish revenues for purposes of study was an integral part of Boniface's scheme to provide educational facilities for those engaged in the *cura animarum*.

#### IV

The example given above of the revenues of the perpetual vicarage of Winkfield in the diocese of Salisbury, calls for further comment. For it presumes that perpetual vicars could be granted *Cum ex eo* licences in the same way as rectors. There is not, indeed, any record in Simon of Ghent's register of a licence to William of Pagula, the vicar of Winkfield, nor, in fact, of a licence granted to any perpetual vicar whatsoever.

<sup>84</sup> Reg. Vat. 52, fol. 16<sup>v</sup>; *Cal. Pap. Letters*, II, 3.

<sup>85</sup> Reg. Vat. 51, fol. 188<sup>r</sup>; *Cal. Pap. Letters*, I, 616. In 1418 Martin V gave a *Cum ex eo* licence for seven years to the rector of Islip, Oxfordshire, with permission to take another benefice (Reg. Lat. 189, fol. 168<sup>v</sup>).

<sup>86</sup> See the letter of John XXII to a rector of diocese of Cahors: quodque per idem quinquennium disciplinis scholasticis insistendo in loco ubi vigeat studium generale, fructus, redditus et proventus ecclesie ad firmam concedere, prout tibi videbitur expedire, libere valeas, generalis concilii et qualibet alia constitucione contraria non obstante (Reg. Vat. 65, fol. 128<sup>v</sup>-129<sup>r</sup>).

<sup>87</sup> See Reg. Vat. fol. 116<sup>v</sup> for a mandate of John XXII in 1331 to various ecclesiastics to see that a rector studying at Avignon received his revenues without further hindrance.

But we do know for certain that Pagula, the great pastoral manualist, was released for studies after his institution to Winkfield in 1314, for we find him engaged in writing his *Summa summarum* at Oxford in 1320/1321, while finishing his studies in the faculty of canon law.<sup>88</sup> Yet none of the legislation concerning clerical education and licences to study which we have considered to date, seems to take perpetual vicars into account. Thus the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215/16 made no provision whatsoever for grants of absence for purposes of study to those vicars about whose standard of living it was otherwise so solicitous;<sup>89</sup> and the constitutions of the Legates Otto and Ottobono, that regulated the ordination and residence of vicars, are also silent on this point. Perpetual vicars, indeed, were bound by the nature of their office to a more demanding residence than that imposed on a rector;<sup>90</sup> and they were bound by the Legatine constitutions to swear to reside continually in their vicarages.<sup>91</sup> How then can we account for the fact that some English perpetual vicars such as William of Pagula seem to have been able to avail themselves of the facilities allowed to rectors by Boniface's constitution *Cum ex eo*?

As it stands, this constitution can hardly be said to envisage *licentiae studendi* for any clerics other than rectors. In fact, the influential English canonist John Acton held that perpetual vicars could not be granted a *Cum ex eo* licence. If he would allow any release of vicars from their very strict obligation of personal residence, this should be within the meaning of the clause 'prout causa ratonabilis id exposcit' of the constitution *Licet canon* of Pope Gregory X: a prolonged absence on Church or State business, or brief excursions for reasons of health, honest recreation or pilgrimage.<sup>92</sup> Writing about 1334-36,<sup>92a</sup> and thus

<sup>88</sup> See L. Boyle, 'The *Oculus sacerdotis* and some other works of William of Pagula,' *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 5th series, 5 (1955), 81-110; A. B. Emden, *A Biographical Register of the University of Oxford*, III, (Oxford, 1959), s.n. Paul, William de.

<sup>89</sup> X. 3.5.30.

<sup>90</sup> *Licet vero Rectores Ecclesiarum ad hoc (in propriis personis ecclesiis deservire) obligantur... tamen fortius est astrictus Vicarius ad obsequium personale quam Rector* (John Acton on Otto, *De institutione vicariorum*, vv. *Cum vicarii teneantur*: in William Lyndwood, *Provinciale... cui adiciuntur Constitutiones Legatinae D. Othonis et D. Othoboni... cum profundissimis notationibus Jo. de Athona* (Oxford, 1679), p. 28).

<sup>91</sup> *Ad vicariam statuimus nullum de caetero fore admittendum nisi... qui... iuret ibi residentiam facere, ac faciat eam continue corporalem...* (Otto, *ibid.*, pp. 24-27).

<sup>92</sup> On the constitution *Ad vicariam* of Otto, vv. *residentiam, continue, ibid.*, pp. 26-27.

<sup>92a</sup> According to F. W. Maitland, *Roman Canon Law in the Church of England* (London, 1898) 6-7, Acton's gloss on the Legatine Constitutions was written between 1333 and 1348, but from remarks in Acton's *Septuagium* (Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge, MS 182,

after the publication of the Clementines, Acton was obliged to take account of a very short but important enactment of Clement V at the Council of Vienne. There, in the constitution *Quae de ecclesiis*, Clement had ordained that certain provisions in the laws which governed rectors were henceforth to be understood as applying to perpetual vicars also: *Quae de ecclesiis, curam animarum habentibus, per receptionem aliarum similium amittendis, ac de ipsarum rectoribus promovendis ad sacerdotium, et de eorum aetate a iure statuta noscentur, in perpetuis ecclesiarum parochialium vicariis et assumptis ad eas volumus observari.*<sup>93</sup> The question, therefore, which Acton had to answer was whether this could be interpreted to mean that perpetual vicars could now avail of Boniface's *Cum ex eo*. The point had been passed over, or perhaps had not occurred to, the canonist Willelmus de Monte Lauduno, whose *Apparatus* on the Clementines had appeared in 1319, two years after these had been promulgated by John XXII;<sup>94</sup> but it had been dealt with at some length seven years later by the influential canonist Joannes Andreae in a manner which caused Acton a little anxiety. Glossing the words 'ad sacerdotium' of the decree *Quae de ecclesiis*, the Bolognese canonist had held that this meant not only that bishops could give licences *Cum ex eo* to vicars for purposes of study, but also that they could dispense vicars from proceeding to the priesthood until the completion of their studies.<sup>95</sup> For Acton, faced with Otto's constitution *Ad vicariam*, and with Ottobono's renewal of it in 1268, this was to ignore a situation in which a local statute imposed a greater obligation of residence on vicars than did the general law of the church. In England, where an oath of residence had to be taken as the Legatine constitutions demanded, it was impossible to act on Andreae's reasoning, since the Legatine oath could not be lightly held, and, considering its origin, could only be dispensed by an authority of equal rank with, or higher than, that which had imposed the oath.<sup>96</sup>

Some of Acton's other arguments are decidedly weak,<sup>97</sup> but this seems to be one which no English bishop could circumvent, if he had not an

fol. 1<sup>r</sup>), written in 1346 (*ibid.*, fol. 140<sup>v</sup>), it is possible to maintain that he wrote the gloss while regent-master at Oxford, and thus probably during the period Sept. 1334-Sept. 1336 when he had a two-year licence to study and became a doctor of both laws. For the career of Acton see Emden, *Biographical Register*, I, (1957), s. n. Acton, John de.

<sup>93</sup> Clementines I.7, cap. un.

<sup>94</sup> Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 247, fol. 163<sup>v</sup>-164<sup>v</sup>. Much of de Monte Lauduno's long passage on the "four types of vicars" has been taken over by Acton in the part of the gloss on the Legatine Constitutions which we are discussing.

<sup>95</sup> *Liber Sextus... una cum Clementinis* (Venice, 1584), col. 67.

<sup>96</sup> Acton on Otto's *Ad vicariam*, ed. cit., pp. 26-7.

express power to dispense from the Legatine oath once it had been taken, or to dispense from it beforehand; normally a direct papal dispensation, or a delegation of the power to dispense was required.<sup>98</sup> Thus in March 1317 the bishop of Norwich was given power to dispense four perpetual vicars from their legatine oath of residence,<sup>99</sup> and in June 1363 Urban V permitted the bishop of Carlisle to dispense ten vicars, 'so that they may study and lecture in canon law for seven years at a university.'<sup>1</sup> Almost two years later, when replying to the complaint of Cambridge University that bishops were slow to grant licences *Cum ex eo* to rectors and perpetual vicars, the same Pope reminded the university that an episcopal licence for study only covered those incumbents (rectors) in whose institution no oath of residence was involved; where such an oath had been taken (perpetual vicars), a dispensation from the oath had to be sought before there was any question of granting a licence.<sup>2</sup> In fact, absence for study without papal

<sup>98</sup> For example, Acton seems to hold that *Quae de ecclesiis* was only meant to embrace *Licet canon* and not *Cum ex eo* in any sense, and, therefore, that no vicar whatsoever, whether bound by an oath of residence or not, could avail himself of *Cum ex eo*. He is here in complete disagreement with what was commonly held by canonists, and by the Papacy. Thus Petrus de Anchiano, glossing *Quae de ecclesiis* towards the end of the fourteenth century, can note without qualification that a perpetual vicar should proceed to the priesthood within a year of institution (*Licet canon*): nisi causa studiorum episcopus dispensaverit secum in septem annis, quod potest sicut cum principali rectore (from *Cum ex eo*): *Super Clementinis Lectura Aurea*, (Lyons, 1549), p. 59.

<sup>99</sup> Delegation to give licences for study were often included in a legate's appointment (Reg. Vat. 56, fol. 269<sup>r</sup>: to Cardinal Arnold, 1309; Reg. Vat. 58, fol. 291<sup>r</sup>: to a legate in Lombardy, 1311). Thus the legate Adrian gave a licence to study to a Durham perpetual vicar in May 1498, because: ratione dicte vicarie quam obtines et in qua residenciam facere teneris, huiusmodi desiderium tuum [studendi] adimplere non potest, canonica dispensacione desuper non obtenta (*Register of Bishop Richard Fox*, ed. M. P. Howden, (Surtees Society, 1932), 116-117; cf. 133).

<sup>99</sup> ... tibi dispensandi cum quatuor perpetuis vicariis parochialium ecclesiarum tue diocesis quod usque ad triennium disciplinis scolasticis in loco vel locis ubi studium generale vigeat insistentio, sive tuis et ecclesie tue obsequiis immorando, in ecclesiis huiusmodi residere minime teneantur, constitutionibus legatorum qui in partibus illis fuisse dicuntur et quibuslibet aliis in contrarium editis nequaquam obstantibus, eciam si iuxta constitutiones easdem de perpetua et personali residencia in dictis ecclesiis facienda... prestiterint iuramentum, plenam et liberam concedimus auctoritate presencium facultatem... (Reg. Vat. 65, fol. 170<sup>r</sup>: cf. *Cal. Pap. Letters*, II, 142; see also Reg. Vat. 56, fol. 89<sup>r</sup>: *Cal. Pap. Letters*, II, 47).

<sup>1</sup> Reg. Suppl. 37, fol. 136: *Cal. Pap. Petitions*, I, 437.

<sup>2</sup> Urban does not state this explicitly, but it underlies a proviso in his reply: ... Salvo quod super residenciam iuramentum non intervenerit, et quod sui ordinarii in aliis ubi iuramentum non est super residenciam dispensaverit (Reg. Suppl. 43, fol. 12<sup>r</sup>; see p. 300, below).

authorization was treated like any other breach of the oath of residence, as a vicar of the diocese of Hereford found in 1320 when Pope John agreed to absolve him for the perjury he had committed 'by daring to break the legatine oath, deserting your vicarage for studies at Oxford,' but would not allow him to retain his living.<sup>3</sup> Any instances there are of licences to perpetual vicars granted on the ordinary power of a bishop do not, in fact, come from England, but from dioceses on the continent, and, strangely, from Ireland. Although Ireland as well as the rest of the British Isles was bound by the Legatine constitutions,<sup>4</sup> a reasonably clear case to the contrary seems to be that of a perpetual vicar in the diocese of Lismore, who was ordered to resign his vicarage in 1373. For although he had had a seven-year licence to study 'on the ordinary authority' of his bishop, his dismissal was not due to this but to the fact that he had broken one of the conditions upon which a *Cum ex eo* licence was issued.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>3</sup> Ex tenore siquidem petitionis tue accepimus quod tu olim perpetuam vicariam parochialis ecclesie de Bromiard Hereforden' diocesis fuisti canonice assecutus, et licet tu secundum formam constitutionum bone memorie Ottonis et Ottobonis dudum apostolicę sedis in Anglia legatorum iurasses in eadem perpetua vicaria residenciam facere personalem, tu tamen *post et contra huiusmodi iuramentum et constitutiones temere veniens, te a predicta vicaria per biennium absentasti Oxonie in iure canonico studendo ... eiusdem vicarie, quam per quatuordecim annos vel circiter tenuisti, percipiendo redditus et proventus...* Nos... tecum auctoritate predicta super periurio quod incurristi non residendo in ipsa vicaria prout ex religione iuramenti super hoc per te, ut prefertur, prestiti tenebaris, de speciali gracia dispensamus. Volumus autem quod vicariam ipsam ex nunc omnino dimittere tenearis... (Reg. Vat. 70, fol. 375<sup>v</sup>-376<sup>r</sup>). The *Cal. Pap. Letters*, II, 197, surely misconstrues the Pope's phrase when it says that "while studying at Oxford he has not resided for fourteen years." Barrett, the vicar in question, had in fact obtained a seven-year *Cum ex eo* licence as a rector in 1301 (Reg. Swinfield, p. 545). If he became a perpetual vicar in 1306, that is fourteen years before his supplication in 1320, then what may have happened was that he continued on at Oxford for the two years which remained of his *Cum ex eo* licence (te a predicta vicaria per biennium absentasti Oxonie), but only adverted to his transgression of the legatine oath some 14 years later.

<sup>4</sup> In quibus locis habent locum constitutiones Ottonis et Ottoboni? Dic quod in Anglia, Scotia, Hibernia et Wallia, ut in constitutione Ottoboni Mandata Dei in prohemio, par. Nos igitur (William of Pagula, *Summa summarum*, MS Bodley 293, fol. 23<sup>r</sup>; cf. Acton on this paragraph of Ottobono, and on Otto, *Quoniam decet*, v. *Angliae*).

<sup>5</sup> ... Sane petitio pro parte tua nobis nuper exhibita continebat, quod cum olim tu perpetuam vicariam parochialis ecclesie de Colmell Lismoren. diocesis tunc vacantem, canonice tibi collatam fuisses pacifice assecutus, et in subdiaconatus ordine constitutus existeres, venerabilis frater noster Thomas episcopus Lismoren. tecum ut litterarum studio in loco ubi illud vigeret generale insistendo usque ad septennium ad superiores ordines te facere promoveri minime tenereris auctoritate ordinaria dispensavit. Cum autem, sicut eadem petitio subiungebat, tu huiusmodi durante septennio, deficientibus tibi expensis, a predicto studio recesseris et in dicta vicaria per unum annum et tres menses vel circiter residenciam

Whatever the situation may have been in Ireland, it may be assumed that English perpetual vicars would have had to seek a papal dispensation from the legatine oath before they could be given a *Cum ex eo* licence.<sup>6</sup> In the case of William of Pagula's release for studies from his perpetual vicarage at Winkfield, it is hardly likely that the problem of the applicability of the Clementine decree *Quae de ecclesiis* was known to Ghent, his bishop, at the time of Pagula's licence, since this decree would not be at all familiar to bishops in England until its promulgation by John XXII in October 1317,<sup>7</sup> two months after Ghent's death. However, apart from a papal dispensation from the legatine oath, there was, possibly, another way open to bishops in England. There is, for instance, a notable difference between the record of Pagula's admission to Winkfield and that of his successor, John Lavyngton, in 1332. Where Lavyngton is said to have been admitted 'de continue residendo iuxta constitutionem Ottoboni iuratus cum onere personaliter ministrandi',<sup>8</sup> Pagula, in the words of Ghent's register, was admitted simply 'cum onere continue residendi et personaliter ministrandi.'<sup>9</sup> Although the formulae in which Ghent's register records admissions to vicarages are loosely worded and not always consistent,<sup>10</sup> the omission of any mention of an oath from the registration of Pagula's admission may not be entirely

*feceris ad sacerdotium non promotus, licet postmodum, habitis expensis huiusmodi, reversus fueris ad studium memoratum, et ex tunc prefatam vicariam detinueris, prout adhuc detines, fructus percipiens ex eadem, dispensacione canonica super hoc non obtenta... Nos itaque... tuis in hac parte supplicationibus inclinati, omnem inhabilitatis et infamie maculam... penitus abolemus. Volumus autem quod tu predictam vicariam ex nunc realiter et omnino dimittas... (Reg. Vat. 284, fol. 4<sup>v</sup>; cfr *Cal Pap. Letters*, IV, 185). For other examples of *Cum ex eo* licences to Irish perpetual vicars see, for instance, *The Register of John Swayne, Archbishop of Armagh, 1418-1439*, ed. D. A. Chart, (Belfast, 1935) 63: licence for seven years' study on 31 August 1427 to Philip Norreys on his admission to the perpetual vicarage of St. Nicholas, Dundalk.*

<sup>6</sup> See, for example, apart from cases already mentioned, dispensations for vicars: non obstantibus Ottonis et Ottoboni constitutionibus, in Innocent VII's pontificate (1404-1406) in Reg. Vat. 119, fol. 121<sup>v</sup> (Bath and Wells), 126<sup>r</sup> (Lincoln), 127<sup>v</sup> (Bath and Wells), 141<sup>r</sup> (York), 142<sup>v</sup> (Carlisle), 148<sup>v</sup> (York), etc.

<sup>7</sup> John XXIII sent the Clementines to the University of Bologna on 25 October 1317 (*CIC*, II, 1131), and to Oxford at the same time (cf. Salisbury Cath. Library, MS 122, fol. 14<sup>v</sup>; Cambridge University Library, MS II.iii.7, fol. 102<sup>v</sup>), some six months, it may be noted, after the dispensation granted to the bishop of Norwich (above, p. 292). Ghent was not present at the Council of Vienne, where *Quae de ecclesiis* was first promulgated, having been excused by Clement V from attendance (E. Müller, *Das Konzil von Vienne* (Münster-W., 1934) 37).

<sup>8</sup> Salisbury Diocesan Registry, MS Reg. Wyvil, II (2), fol. 19<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, MS Reg. S. de Gandavo, fol. 132<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. *Reg. S. de Gandavo* (edition), pp. 559, 662, 825.

arbitrary. Certainly a bishop could not remit the legatine oath in whole or in part,<sup>11</sup> but he could, presumably, defer the taking of the oath for a reasonable cause: in much the same way, therefore, as a rector with a *Cum ex eo* licence was not bound to the *cura animarum* as such until he had finished his studies, a perpetual vicar of promise conceivably could be excused from the taking of the legatine oath until he had returned from the university and had formally taken over the *cura animarum*; the legal fiction would not be very different from that employed in the grant of *Cum ex eo* licences to rectors, especially where there was, as at Winkfield, a resident assistant priest who was used to the parish. In fact the wording of the legatine constitution does not state beyond all doubt that the oath had to be taken before institution; certainly the phrase 'statuimus nullum de caetero fore admittendum nisi... iuret ibi residentiam facere' has not the force of 'nisi... iurasset' or of 'nisi... iuret ante admissionem.' On this point it is interesting to note that Acton, commenting on the word 'admittendum' in the legatine constitution quoted above, says rather mildly that 'it is fitting (expedit) that the oath should be taken before admission';<sup>12</sup> he does not state that it was necessary for the validity of the admission that the oath should be taken on the spot.

Since there is no record of a papal dispensation to Pagula, it therefore seems possible to hold that Ghent, or any other bishop in a similar situation, simply postponed the legatine oath, and thus avoided the need of a papal dispensation or the danger of perjury. At all events, the question of the release of perpetual vicars for study was complicated in England by the legatine oath.<sup>13</sup> But where the residence of vicars was not governed by any special legislation such as that of Otto and Otto-

<sup>11</sup> See Acton on Otto, *Ad vicariam*, ed. cit., p. 126, v. *faciat*.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, v. *admittendum*.

<sup>13</sup> It is interesting to note that an Oxford canonist, Thomas Walkyngton, writing about 1377, disagrees with Acton, and is of the opinion that bishops could dispense perpetual vicars in England. Since the legatine constitutions were only *consilia*, the bishops could choose to ignore them on occasion: Hoc non potest esse iuxta causam *cum ex eo* quod persona contra consilium superioris non licet inferiori dispensare. Sed ille constitutiones Ottoboni et Ottonis sunt consilium; ideo... Ex quibus concludo quod non obstante statuto Ottoboni potest episcopus dispensare... (Canterbury, Dean and Chapter Library, MS C. 12, fol. 97<sup>v</sup>-98<sup>r</sup>). William of Pagula, however, is unexpectedly silent on some of the points discussed above. Thus, although he quotes *Quae de ecclesiis* with reference to the ordination of vicars to the priesthood (*Summa summarum*, MS Bodley 293, fol. 49<sup>v</sup>), and discusses *Cum ex eo* licences and the release of rectors for study, he nowhere deals with perpetual vicars and study, nor with the extent to which *Quae de ecclesiis* put vicars on an equal footing with rectors. See also *Summa summarum* fol. 210<sup>v</sup>-211<sup>r</sup>.



bono, there was no difficulty, after Clement's *Quae de ecclesiis*, in granting licences *Cum ex eo* as readily to vicars as to rectors. The perpetual vicar was, after all, as much committed to, and engaged in, the pastoral care as the rector; and, no less than the rector, would have need of, and derive benefit from, the facilities afforded by Boniface's scheme of allowing parishes to pay for the education of those clerics to whom they had been entrusted.

## V

It goes without saying that Boniface's constitution was far from perfect and that his measure never really solved the abiding problem of *ignorantia sacerdotum*. Yet it cannot be denied that the promulgation of *Cum ex eo* in 1298 is a moment of considerable importance in the history of medieval education, if only because of the examples given above of the care with which the provisions of the constitution were observed. It is therefore surprising that the constitution *Cum ex eo* has merited little attention from historians. It rarely occurs in works on the history of the canon law or of education in the middle ages;<sup>14</sup> it is almost wholly absent from studies of the career and pontificate of Pope Boniface VIII.<sup>15</sup>

<sup>14</sup> For example, it does not receive any treatment in Hasting Rashdall's *History of the Universities*, in Leach's *Educational Charters*, in Lynn Thorndike's *University Records and Life in the Middle Ages* (New York, 1944), in Stelling-Michaud's fine summary of recent research on the history of the Universities ('L'Histoire des Universités au Moyen Age et à la Renaissance au cours des vingt-cinq dernières années,' *XI<sup>e</sup> Congrès International des Sciences Historiques, Rapports* (Stockholm, 1960), I, 97-143) or in P. Kibre, *Scholarly Privileges in the Middle Ages. The Rights, Privileges and Immunities of Scholars and Universities at Bologna, Padua, Paris, and Oxford* (London, 1961); and it only gets a passing mention in F. W. Oediger, *Über die Bildung der Geistlichen im späten Mittelalter* (Leiden-Köln, 1953), p. 59, n. 5, and in A. F. Sokolich, *Canonical provisions for Universities and Colleges* (Washington, 1956) 25. On the other hand, many editors of bishops' registers, and some historians of the Church in England in the fourteenth century, have remarked on the number of licences given by bishops, notably, Miss E. C. Carlyle, *The Office of an English Bishop in the first half of the Fourteenth Century* (Pennsylvania, 1903) 21; Miss Kathleen Edwards, 'Bishops and Learning in the Reign of Edward II,' *Church Quarterly Review*, 138 (1944), 79; and C. J. Godfrey, 'Non-residence of parochial clergy in the fourteenth century,' *ibid.*, 162 (1961), 433-446. A translation of a typical *Cum ex eo* licence (from Carlisle diocese, 1315) is given by C. J. Offler, *The Bishop's Register* (London, 1929) 136; there are also some notes on licences in I. J. Churchill, *Canterbury Administration* (London, 1933), I, 115-117, and in A. Hamilton Thompson, *The English Clergy* (Oxford, 1947) 103-104.

<sup>15</sup> For example, those of H. Finke, *Aus den Tagen Bonifaz VIII* (Münster-in-W.. 1903), T.S.R. Boase, *Boniface VIII* (London, 1933), S. Silvia, *Bonifazio VIII* (Rome, 1949). A strong plea, in which *Cum ex eo* is mentioned briefly, for an evaluation of the full character of Boniface VIII has been made by G. Le Bras, 'Boniface VIII, Symphoniste et modérateur,' *Mélanges Louis Halphen*, (Paris, 1951) 383-384.

This reticence becomes all the more remarkable when one notes with what enthusiasm bishops responded to the constitution, and in what numbers the parochial clergy enjoyed licences *Cum ex eo*. Indeed, it is not an exaggeration to state that in contrast to the parochial clergy of the thirteenth century, those of the fourteenth century flocked to the universities. There were, of course, bishops of the stature of Grosseteste of Lincoln, Cantilupe of Hereford and Pecham of Canterbury in the thirteenth century, who were as acutely aware of the need for an educated clergy as the many bishops in England who granted *Cum ex eo* licences in the next century, but the real difference between the practice of the two centuries, with respect to university studies for the parochial clergy, may be attributed to the fact that after the appearance of Boniface's constitution there was now an official directive which bishops could follow with equanimity, secure in the knowledge that they were not conniving in any way at a form of non-residence which was not regularized beyond all reproach. Few, indeed, of the astonishingly large number of licences granted in England in the fourteenth century fail to include the significant phrase, 'secundum constitutionem domini Bonifatii octavi.' It is at once a key to, and a justification of, the bishops' toleration of 'absenteeism' from the pastoral care.

The number of licences granted by English bishops in the fifty years after the promulgation of *Cum ex eo* is indeed remarkable; if nothing else, it suggests that the desire to promote the education of the parochial clergy was stronger and more vital than in the days of the abortive attack on *Licet canon* at the Council of Reading in 1279. In the diocese of Winchester, for example, Henry Woodlock granted some 105 licences between 1305 and 1316; in that of Worcester almost 100 were granted by Walter Reynolds between 1308 and 1313; in Exeter Bishop Stapledon gave over 400 licences between 1307 and 1326, and Bishop Brantyngham some 86 from 1370-1394.<sup>16</sup> And if Hamo Hethe of Rochester gave only 43 licences in a very long episcopate (1319-1357), Bishop Drokenesford of Bath and Wells kept up a steady flow of rectors to the universities, issuing 15 licences in 1320, 17 in 1321, 19 in 1322, and 16 in 1323,<sup>17</sup> while in the ten years of Bishop Cobham's episcopate at Worcester (1317-1327), 93 licences for an absence of 1 year were given, 37 for two years, 11 for three years, 1 for five years, and 5 for the maximum licence.<sup>18</sup>

<sup>16</sup> For these figures see Godfrey, *art. cit.*, pp. 434-435, etc.

<sup>17</sup> See E. C. Lyle, *op. cit.*, p. 21.

<sup>18</sup> E. H. Pearce, *Thomas de Cobham, Bishop of Worcester, 1317-1327* (London, 1923) 101.

The episcopate of Simon of Ghent, bishop of Salisbury (1297-1316) is, perhaps, the most striking and documented of all, and some of our best examples of the working of *Cum ex eo* have been taken from it in the pages above. He issued his first licence 'secundum formam novae constitutionis domini Bonifatii octavi' within six months of the promulgation of the constitution in the Sext, the forerunner, indeed, of the large number of 308 licences which he was to grant during the seventeen and a half years of his episcopate.<sup>19</sup> The majority of these were for periods varying from one to three years, a small portion running to the maximum seven years. As is only to be expected of a former Chancellor, the University of Oxford was the *studium* usually specified in these licences, with permission here and there for other *studia* in England (Cambridge, Marlborough, 'alibi in Anglia ubi viget studium generale'), and a few licences for study abroad at Paris or Orleans.

The extensive use made by bishops of the faculty to grant licences to study, and the interest that the constitution *Cum ex eo* evoked at all levels of ecclesiastical life, leave one with a distinct impression that Boniface's measure played a very important part in the life of the church from the beginning of the fourteenth century until the Council of Trent, both in England and in Europe.<sup>19a</sup> Indeed, the constitution was regarded so highly, and looked upon as so vital to the health of the *cura animarum*, that the Council of Constance made an explicit exception of *Cum ex eo* licences when it decreed a clean sweep of all dispensations at its third session 21 March 1418: 'Nos igitur, sacro approbante concilio, omnes dispensationes a quibuscumque pro Romanis pontifi-

105; *idem*, ed. *The Register of Thomas de Cobham*, (Worcestershire Hist. Soc., 1930) 250-263. Many more instances could be given from episcopal registers, but it must be remembered that the number of rectors released for studies generally is smaller than the number of licences issued, since many of these licences were extensions of previous licences.

<sup>19</sup> See K. Edwards, *art. cit.*, p. 79.

<sup>19a</sup> For England, the most impressive evidence, apart from certain episcopal registers, is to be found in Mr A. B. Emden's great *Biographical Register of the University of Oxford*, 3 vols. (Oxford, 1957-9), where large numbers of licences to study are recorded. For Europe in general the evidence at present is less plentiful, mainly because few episcopal registers are in print. Yet a good picture of the application of *Cum ex eo* in continental dioceses can be built up from cases that occur in papal registers. Thus the summary of a petition in a papal letter will often state that the petitioner has a licence *Cum ex eo* issued on "the ordinary authority" of, for example, the ordinary of Rodez (Reg. Vat. 55, fol. 135r), Agen (56, fol. 14r, 31r; 59, fol. 132r), Rouen (59, fol. 180r), Cahors (*ibid.*, fol. 248r), Mende (58, fol. 147r), Angoulême (*ibid.*, fol. 197r), Lausanne (59, fol. 17r), Utica (*ibid.*, fol. 182r), Braga (60, fol. 180r), Porto (*ibid.*, fol. 248r), all from the pontificate of Clement V (1305-1314).

cibus se gerentibus concessas quibuscumque electis, confirmatis, seu provisus ad ecclesias, monasteria, prioratus conventuales, decanatus, archidiaconatus, et alia quaecumque beneficia, quibus certus ordo debitus est, vel annexus,... praeter illas quae secundum formam constitutionis Bonifacii VIII quae incipit *Cum ex eo* factae sunt, revocamus.' <sup>20</sup>

From a period some fifty years earlier there is an even more striking instance, which we may quote in full, of the place which Boniface's constitution had won for itself, when, in 1365, the Chancellor and Masters of Cambridge University went so far as to petition Pope Urban V to allow the university to grant, among other things, licences *Cum ex eo* to rectors and vicars whom bishops had refused; English bishops, the petition said, were proving 'inordinately difficult' about issuing *Cum ex eo* dispensations, thus unjustly hindering clerics with a cure of souls from proficiency in branches of learning which would be of benefit to themselves and to others:

Supplicatur sanctitas vestra ex parte... cancellarii et doctorum et magistrorum regentium et non regentium universitatis nostre Cantebrigg' Eliensis diocesis, quod cum locorum ordinarii suis rectoribus et curatis studere volentibus ad dandam licentias studendi in forma capituli *Cum ex eo* sepius se reddant ultra modum difficiles, propter quod curati ipsi ut in huiusmodi scientiis proficiant, per quas sibi et aliis reddi possent multipliciter fructuosi, sunt indebite impediti; quare, omnibus et singulis parochialium ecclesiarum rectoribus et perpetuis vicariis, ac aliis, beneficia quaecumque etiam curata aut dignitates, personatus vel officia, cum cura vel sine, etiam in ecclesiis cathedralibus obtinentibus, in dicta universitate studere volentibus, etiam si in presbiteratus ordine fuerint constitui, iura canonica seu facultatem theologie, necnon et in subdiaconatus vel diaconatus ordine constituti, iura civilia ad triennium audire, legere et in eisdem studere ac fructus et cetera beneficiorum suorum interim integre recipere valeant, licentia ordinarii petita nec obtenta, quodque subdiaconi vel diaconi interim ad alios superiores ordines non teneantur promoveri, dignemini licentiam imperitari cum omnibus clausulis oportunis.

<sup>20</sup> H. von der Hardt, *Corpus Actorum et Decretorum Magni Concilii Constantiensis* (Frankfurt-Leipzig, 1699), IV, 1537; H. Finke, *Acta Concilii Constantiensis*, II, (Münster-in-W., 1923), 632-633. See also John Gerson, *Opera Omnia*, ed. L. E. du Pin, (Paris, 1727), III, 90 (*Regulae morales*, 68). The papal system of dispensation had deteriorated from the pontificate of Clement VI (1342-1352) onwards, and many rectors and vicars were given licences: vel studio litterarum vel in curia episcopali vel in uno ex beneficiis tuis, on terms similar to those regulating ordination in *Cum ex eo*; see, for example Reg. Vat. 159 (1343). By the end of the fourteenth century some papal licences for study were startlingly generous, giving licences "for life" to rectors and perpetual vicars: see, for example, Reg. Lat., 45, from the pontificate of Boniface IX. The only study-licences that the Council of Constance allowed to continue were simple *Cum ex eo* licences.

In the matter of *Cum ex eo* licences for the parochial clergy, Pope Urban gave the university little satisfaction, replying to their petition in a manner which in fact did not withdraw these licences from the control of the bishops, nor remove the obstacle of the legatine oath of residence sworn by perpetual vicars:

Placet quod studentes omnes fructus beneficiorum suorum percipiant ad triennium. Item placet quod non teneantur promoveri infra dictum tempus habentes parochiales ecclesias, dummodo infra annum recipiant subdiaconatus ordinem. Salvo quod super residentiam iuramentum non intervenerit, et quod sui ordinarii, in aliis ubi iuramentum non est, super residentiam dispensaverint.<sup>21</sup>

Some two centuries later, in the middle period of the Council of Trent, we find that *Cum ex eo* is still a force, although reformers like Reginald Pole had misgivings about it, since so much depended on the goodwill of those who obtained licences and on the vigilance of bishops. At a national synod in London in 1556, Pole drew up some very severe legislation on residence, allowing, however, for absences 'prout causa rationabilis id exposcet' (*Licet canon*) and for those 'studiorum causa' (*Cum ex eo*). But he begged bishops to make sure that candidates for licences for study were of good quality, and that the leave of absence was really spent in study at a university.<sup>22</sup>

The legislation of the Council of Trent on residence (1547, 1563) and on the setting-up of seminaries (1563) did not do away immediately with licences *Cum ex eo*. For although the Congregation of the Council, the official interpreter of the Tridentine decrees, soon took exception to licences for study, it was forced to confess that non-residence in accordance with Boniface's constitution could be allowed on occasion, 'cum id non sit contra ius commune, nec contra concilium, sed solummodo

<sup>21</sup> *Reg. Supplicationum* 48 (formerly 41), fol. 127; cf. *Cal. Pap. Petitions*, I, 504.

<sup>22</sup> Eorum autem, quibus, studiorum gratia, ad certum tempus indultum sit, ne ad eos ordines promoveri teneantur, ad quos ratione beneficiorum quae obtinent promovendi essent, et ut absentes nihilominus fructus percipiant, quia plerique in nulla ex universitatibus, in quibus studium generale viget, sed in locis ubi nullus est studiorum usus atque exercitatio commorantur, et non pauci etiam in studiis generalibus degentes, quidvis potius aliud agunt, quam ut litteris operam dent: idcirco ne dolus et fraus hac in re cuiquam patrocinetur, omnibus locorum ordinariis mandamus, ut posthac, antequam ulli suae iurisdictionis huiusmodi indulta concedant, diligenter inquirent an is ad litterarum studia sit aptus, et an eae disciplinae, quibus operam se daturum profiteatur, tales sint, quae ei conveniant, et ecclesiae futurae sint utiles, et an temere vel in fraudem hanc licentiam petat... (*Reformatio Angliae ex Decretis Reginaldi Pole Cardinalis Sedis Apostolicae Legati* (Rome, 1562), 13).

contra decisionem congregationis.’<sup>23</sup> By the mid-seventeenth century, however, the Congregation had succeeded in outlawing *Cum ex eo* licences; and the fact that *Cum ex eo* had outlived its time had impressed itself on most manuals of the pastoral care and of canon law.<sup>24</sup> In 1661 Prosper Fagnanus, who was secretary of the Congregation of the Council and who in fact provides one of the best discussions of Boniface’s constitution, would admit at the end that he had only been arguing ‘disputationis causa,’ when he had proved that *Cum ex eo* licences were not at variance with the Tridentine legislation on the residence of the parochial clergy.<sup>25</sup>

But it was the Tridentine legislation on seminaries which really outmoded *Cum ex eo* as a practical, and not wholly unsuccessful, means of providing some education for the parochial clergy, in the absence of anything more positive. Where Boniface had proposed that each parish should directly sustain the educational expenses of the particular cleric to whose charge it was committed, Trent had now made the provision of an educated parish clergy a charge of a diocese as a whole; and where Boniface had merely encouraged a general education of not more than seven years’ duration after institution to a parish and before ordination, Trent had imposed a course of ecclesiastical studies of much the same length, without which one could not be admitted to the priesthood,

<sup>23</sup> See the decision of the Congregation on 12 July 1601 allowing a parish priest to finish his studies at Coimbra, in *Summa Apostolicarum Decisionum*, (Lyons, 1703), p. 328. Earlier the Congregation had ruled that *Cum ex eo* licences could only be given to clerics under thirty years of age, and that: haec facultas solum habet locum in parochialibus ante Concilium Tridentinum obtentis, quia in obtentis post Concilium praedicta licentia non datur (*Decisiones et Declarationes Illustrissimorum Cardinalium Sacri Concilii Tridentini Interpretum*, ed. J. de Gallemart, (Douai, 1615), 147-8). See also the “Declaratio quod gratiae de non residendo et percepiendo fructus ratione studii non valeant sine consensu ordinarii” of Pius IV on 24 November 1564, in *Canones et Decreta Concilii Tridentini*, ed. H. Lutus Calliensis, (Venice, 1566), appendix, Bb iv.

<sup>24</sup> Quamvis olim potuerit parochus studiorum causa abesse per septennium ex consensu et licentia episcopi, ut deciditur in capitulo Cum ex eo, De electione, Libro Sexto, hodie tamen id non permittitur (A. Barbosa, *Pastoralis Sollicitudinis sive De officio et potestate Parochi* (Lyons, 1640), 77). See also *Collectanea Doctorum in Concilium Tridentinum* (Venice, 1643), p. 176, n. 55; J. B. Possevinus, *De officio curati*, ed. A. Victorelli, (Venice, 1668), 14; S. d’Abreu, *Institutio Parochi*, (Venice, 1699), 71.

<sup>25</sup> Caeterum haec disputationis gratia dicta sunt: nam proposito in S. Congregatione Concilii dubio infrascripto, videlicet, an ordinarius possit concedere licentiam parocho, qui parochialem post Concilium obtinuit, ut in publica universitate studiis sacrae Theologiae vel Canonum vacare possit?... Sanctissimus respondit non posse, jussitque Episcopos ab huiusmodi licentiae concessione abstinere (P. Fagnanus, *Commentaria in V. libros Decretalium* (Cologne, 1705), III, 87<sup>b</sup>, commenting on *Super specula*, X. 5.5.5: *De Magistris* and *Cum ex eo*).

much less to the *cura animarum*. There is, nevertheless, a continuity between Boniface and Trent that is more real than apparent. The emphases are different, but the fundamental idea is the same. In fact, the Tridentine seminary legislation improved on rather than rejected the solution of the problem of the education of the parochial clergy which had held the field from the promulgation of Boniface VIII's constitution *Cum ex eo* in 1298.

*Angelicum, Rome, and  
Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies*

# Analogy as a Thomistic Approach to Being

JOSEPH OWENS, C. Ss. R.

## I

PARTLY owing to recent concern with religious language<sup>1</sup> among linguistic analysts, partly because of efforts to restore analogy of intrinsic attribution to the place indicated by certain Thomistic texts,<sup>2</sup> a marked renewal of interest in the problem of analogy in St Thomas Aquinas has made itself manifest in the last few years. The interest stimulated by discussions on analogy during the twenties and thirties of the present century<sup>3</sup> never did as a matter of fact fade away, in spite of the warning by Gilson that the pertinent texts are comparatively few in number and surprisingly restrained in scope,<sup>4</sup> and of the claim by Lyttkens that analogy of proportionality does not "play that central part in St. Thomas, which is ascribed to him in Thomistic quarters."<sup>5</sup> The present revival of investigation has the merit of breaking away from the confines in which the topic was restricted by the traditions of Cajetan and of Suarez. In the one tradition, analogy of proper proportionality was the sole truly metaphysical type. In the other, analogy of intrinsic attribution alone played that role. Other procedures that used the name of analogy were judged narrowly from these respective viewpoints.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> E.g., James F. Ross, 'Analogy as a Rule of Meaning for Religious Language,' *International Philosophical Quarterly*, I (1961), 468-502.

<sup>2</sup> E.g., T. Marguerite Flanigan, 'The Use of Analogy in the *Summa Contra Gentiles*,' *The Modern Schoolman*, XXXV (1957), 21-37. Ralph J. Masiello, 'The Analogy of Proportion according to the Metaphysics of St. Thomas,' *The Modern Schoolman*, XXXV (1958), 91-105.

<sup>3</sup> E.g., J. M. Ramírez, 'De Analogia secundum Doctrinam Aristotelico-Thomisticam,' *La Ciencia Tomista*, XXIV (1921), 20-40; 195-214; 337-357; XXV (1922), 17-38. J. Le Rohellec, 'De Fundamento Metaphysico Analogiae,' *Divus Thomas* (Piac.), XXIX (1926), 77-101; 664-691; 'Cognitio Nostra Analogica de Deo,' XXX (1927), 298-319. T.-L. Penido, *Le rôle de l'analogie en théologie dogmatique* (Paris, 1931). Gerald B. Phelan, *Saint Thomas and Analogy* (Milwaukee, 1941). For the other notable contributions, see the working bibliography in George P. Klubertanz, *St. Thomas Aquinas on Analogy* (Chicago, 1960), pp. 303-313. The pertinent texts of St. Thomas are collected and analytically indexed by Klubertanz, pp. 163-302.

<sup>4</sup> Etienne Gilson, *The Christian Philosophy of St. Thomas Aquinas*, tr. L. K. Shook (New York, 1956), pp. 105-106.

<sup>5</sup> Hampus Lyttkens, *The Analogy between God and the World* (Uppsala, 1952), p. 475.

<sup>6</sup> On the traditions see Lyttkens, pp. 205-241; Klubertanz, pp. 7-12.



The present discussions have the freshness and the verve that come from sincere efforts to transcend these traditional limitations and treat the problem against the broader background of its actual history. The explanation of being through analogy has roots that extend much too deeply into the long history of western metaphysics to allow its solution to be given in a framework of sixteenth century thought.

The whole problem, moreover, is now approached in a way that permits it to be treated of, much more than previously, on its own merits and just in itself. This will be readily appreciated by those who remember the enthusiasm with which analogy was advocated in the twenties and thirties as the master key for opening all the innermost chambers of Thomistic metaphysics. Its privileged function was taken for granted. The whole conatus of the discussions was to establish it as well as possible on the basis of the limited Thomistic texts, and then use it as a tool in explaining the doctrine of being. In the setting developed by Cajetan true metaphysical analogy was restricted to analogy of proper proportionality. As a courteous bow to the Aristotelian background of the doctrine, analogy of attribution was allowed in one way or another to be contained virtually in proper proportionality when applied to the problem of being.<sup>7</sup> But any application of analogy of attribution in its own right and intrinsically to being, had to be regarded as Suarezian in inspiration and fundamentally anti-Thomistic. The stage was not set for an overall discussion of the general problem of analogy in metaphysics, apart from previous commitment to a determined role already given it for the explanation of being. Today, however, the atmosphere seems sufficiently clear to allow hope of profit in a meta-analogical investigation of the topic.

As is well known and is recognized by all the participants in the discussion, the roots of the problem, historically, are to be sought in the Aristotelian treatises. Aristotle's general doctrine was that being was expressed neither univocally, nor purely equivocally, but still "in many ways."<sup>8</sup> This provided a clearcut framework for the later Scholastic developments of the topic. In the Neoscholastic writings, accordingly, there were the two extremes of univocity and equivocality, with the broad area between them handed over indiscriminately to the domain of analogy.

<sup>7</sup> E.g., John of St. Thomas, *Ars Logica*, II, 13, 4; ed. B. Reiser (Turin, 1930) I, 490a 4-13. Le Rohellec, *Divus Thomas*, XXIX (1926), pp. 82-83, tries to make this situation more palatable by maintaining that attribution does not of its nature exclude proportionality, and so, *per accidens*, may allow the form to be inherent in the secondary instances.

<sup>8</sup> *Metaph.*, I 2, 1003a33-b15; K 3, 1060b32-1061a10.

The fidelity of this situation to its historical roots is very much open to question. Even with the concession that "equivocal by chance"<sup>9</sup> was identified with the purely equivocal by Aristotle, the rich fields of meaning between it and the univocal were not brought by him under the one designation "analogical." Rather, analogy was only one among several manners in which a notion could be "expressed in many ways" without thereby becoming equivocal by chance.<sup>10</sup> There are a number of these ways applied by Aristotle to being,<sup>11</sup> but analogy is conspicuously not one of them.<sup>12</sup> As the doctrine was handed down to the Scholastics by Boethius, "equivocals by design" (*consilio*) were distinguished from "equivocals by chance" (*casu*); and under "equivocals by design" were included, along with other types, analogy (*secundum proportionem*) and reference.<sup>13</sup> There need be little surprise, then, to find St. Thomas calling "equivocal"<sup>14</sup> what the Neoscholastics would place under analogy.

Are these discrepancies between Neoscholastic use and its historical antecedents merely a matter of terminology? Or do the variations in terminology indicate deep doctrinal divergencies? The real difficulties and problems raised by the present-century discussions could hardly be so persistent if the trouble were just with words. Moreover, no misunderstanding has even arisen from the arbitrary restriction of the term "univocal" to denote things that have the same definition as designated by the same word. Etymologically it signifies merely designation by one word, whether the things so designated are different

<sup>9</sup> Aristotle, *E N*, I 6,1096b26-27. The example of *Zōion* for "animal" and "painting," as given by Aristotle in the *Categories* (1,1a1-6) is classed by Boethius (see infra, n. 13) as an "equivocal by design." The other Aristotelian examples are *kleis* (*E N*, V 1,1129a29-31) for "key" and "collarbone," and *onos* (*Top.*, I 15,107a19-21) for "donkey" and "windless." These examples are not of the purely equivocal type found for example in "date" as a day of the month and as the fruit of a palm.

<sup>10</sup> I have discussed this topic at some length in *The Doctrine of Being in the Aristotelian Metaphysics* (Toronto, 1951), pp. 49-63.

<sup>11</sup> *Metaph.*, *A* 7,1017a7-b8; *E* 2,1026a33-b2.

<sup>12</sup> See G. L. Muskens, *De Vocis Analogias Significatione ac Usu apud Aristotelem* (Groningen, 1943).

<sup>13</sup> Boethius, *In Cat. Arist.*, I; PL LXIV, 166BC.

<sup>14</sup> E.g.: "... sicut ille qui docet in scholis dicitur magister, et similiter ille qui praeest domui dicitur magister domus, aequivoce, et tamen propinqua aequivocatione propter similitudinem; uterque enim est rector, hic quidem scholarum, ille vero domus. Unde propter hanc propinquitatem vel generis vel similitudinis, non videntur esse aequivocationes, cum tamen sint." *In VII Phys.*, lect. 8, (ed. Leonine) no. 8. Cf. *De Ente*, c. IV (ed. Roland-Gosselin), p. 35.24-28; *CG*, IV, 29, Sed licet; *ST*, I, 13, 10, ad 4m; *In X Metaph.*, lect. 3, (ed. Cathala-Spiazzi) no. 1982. On St. Thomas' conception of the different grades of equivocity, see *In VII Phys.*, loc. cit.

in definition or not. Correspondingly the term "equivocal" signifies, etymologically, equal designation by the same word. Only by linguistic use is it restricted to things that differ in definition. The Aristotelian technical terms that these words were used to translate were open each to both meanings. *Synonymon*, the term translated by "univocal," is found used by the Stagirite<sup>15</sup> for the designation of things that are not univocal in the established technical sense of the word. *Homonymon*, technically rendered by "equivocal," is likewise found used by Aristotle in the now established sense of univocal.<sup>16</sup> Yet these facts have never caused any real trouble in the discussions on univocity and equivocity.

Why then should etymological considerations be of any real concern in the philosophical use of the term "analogy"? Etymologically, the word means "proportion" or "according to a ratio." As is well enough known, its technical use in philosophy was taken by Aristotle from its application in mathematics. Originally it meant equality of ratio in different sets of terms.<sup>17</sup> As two is to four, so six is to twelve. The ratio in both sets is half. Transferred to use outside the mathematical order, it changes the required equality in ratio to similarity in relations: "the second is related to the first as the fourth is to the third."<sup>18</sup> In this way as sight is to the eye, so intelligence is to the soul.<sup>19</sup> Such analogies run through all the categories of being, and constitute a wider basis for grouping things than do the genera.<sup>20</sup> They require four terms, since the similarity is between two relations, with each relation demanding two terms. In mathematics the same number could function as two terms, namely as the two inner terms of the analogy. Two is to four as four is to eight is a perfectly legitimate type. It may be transposed to read that four is to eight as two is to four. What is not allowed is to use the same term in the first and third positions. Two is to four as two is to  $x$  is merely repetition, not analogy. The advantage of analogy is that when three of the terms are known the fourth can be reached. Knowing that the ratio of three to  $x$  is that of two to six, you know as a conclusion that  $x$  is nine.

<sup>15</sup> *Metaph.*,  $\alpha$  1,993b25. Accordingly St. Thomas, *In II Metaph.*, lect. 2, uses *univoce* (no. 292) and *univocatione* (no. 293) for predication according to various degrees of perfection.

<sup>16</sup> See Bonitz, *Ind. Arist.*, 514b13-18. Cf.: "Quinto secundum acquivocationem, idest secundum communicationem nominum, . ." St. Thomas, *ST*, III, 2, 6c.

<sup>17</sup> Aristotle, *EN*, V 3,1131a29-b17.

<sup>18</sup> Aristotle, *Po.*, 21,1457b16-18.

<sup>19</sup> Aristotle, *Top.*, I 17,108a11.

<sup>20</sup> Aristotle, *Metaph.*,  $\Delta$  6,1017a1-3.

So understood, analogy offers alluring prospects of application in philosophical problems. Knowing what sight is and what the eye is, knowing also the relation of the one to the other, and knowing what intelligence is and that intelligence has a corresponding relation to soul, one should have the means of reasoning to what soul is. Yet, as is quite obvious, considerable care is demanded in the use of this procedure outside mathematical fields. One must be sure that one has independent knowledge of the three terms, and that the third term is really susceptible of a proportion similar to that which holds between the other two. This cannot be expected to turn out as facile as in the univocal relations between mathematical terms. The ratios in the sets of terms will not be strictly the same, but only similar. Great caution, therefore, will have to be used in the further application of a proportion taken from any one set of the terms.

But does this mathematical origin of the notion require that the term "analogy" be kept restricted to four-term relations in its philosophical use? Actually it has not been, as anyone acquainted with mediaeval metaphysics is well aware. It became current as the designation of the Aristotelian predication by reference to a single nature, for instance in the predication of being through reference to a primary instance. This involved only a two-term relation, as in the relation of an effect to its cause or a of sign to the thing signified. St Thomas, in fact, could introduce the application of analogy to important philosophical problem without even mentioning the four-term kind.<sup>21</sup> Is this seemingly alien extension of the word "analogy" workable in terms of its own proper vocabulary, or is it bound to engender confusion?

Clearly, the question cannot be settled through merely etymological considerations, nor even on the basis of historical precedents. In the case of the terms for univocals and equivocals, the etymology was non-committal; and there are instances of their use in senses opposed to those that became technical. From these angles there appears no reason why "analogy" should not be given new senses in philosophical vocabulary. The problem, rather, centers around linguistic techniques. Given that linguistic uses of a word and its derivatives are already firmly established, can a new technical use of that word be introduced without giving rise to impossible linguistic situations? If such situations are inevitably entailed by the new use of the word, its application in this sense may be expected to cause notable confusion.

<sup>21</sup> E.g., CG, I, 34.

Finally, even if the extension of the word "analogy" to two-term relations be granted, is it even then capable of signifying all the procedures found in the wide area between univocity and pure equivocality? Or are there in this area other ways of predication that cannot by any accepted understanding of the word be brought under the heading of analogy? Is analogy, in whatever different ways it has been used, wide enough to serve as the approach to being in a Thomistic context? Or is it just one among several required approaches to the problem? If it happens in its actual use to be only one among many approaches, is there any way of bringing these further approaches under its sway, and so to establish it as a single term that covers the whole area between pure equivocality on the one hand and univocity on the other? Is it at all possible to make the situation that simple, at least from a viewpoint of external systematization?

These, then, are questions that arise when the problem of being is approached against a background that excludes univocity and pure equivocality, and seeks to cover the whole intermediate territory by a procedure or procedures named analogy. By the same token, though, any such procedure that may in Scotistic fashion be explained in terms of concepts one the same and the others different, is completely excluded from the discussion. That procedure would obviously be univocity, as understood in the Aristotelian setting. In the species of a genus there is the same generic concept and there are the concepts of the differentiae.<sup>22</sup> The specific concepts accordingly are partly the same and partly different. But both sameness and difference are each effected by respective univocal concepts. Not at all in this sense are the things in the intermediate territory both same and different. Here, partly the same and partly different does not mean the same by one concept and different by another concept. Rather, the one concept that renders the things the same is the concept that renders them different. Conversely, the concept that makes them different is the concept that makes them coincide under the one notion.<sup>23</sup> Identity and yet differentiation by the

<sup>22</sup> On the problem of analogy among things denoted univocally by a generic concept, see Armand Maurer, 'St. Thomas and the Analogy of Genus,' *The New Scholasticism*, XXIX (1955), 127-144.

<sup>23</sup> See Gerald B. Phelan, *Saint Thomas and Analogy* (Milwaukee, 1941), pp. 29-30. Cajetan, *De Nominum Analogia*, c. IV, (ed. Zammit) no. 36, regards the analogous things as simply (*simpliciter*) different but in some way (*secundum quid, idest secundum proportionem*) the same. If this terminology is to be used, the *secundum quid* cannot be conceived in any univocal manner. Both the difference and the sameness have to be essential to the notion—"eandem formam in pluribus inveniri essentialiter dissimilem simul et essentialiter similem"—J. Le Rohellec, 'De Fundamento Metaphysico Analogiae,' *Divus Thomas* (Piac.), XXIX (1926), 89. No infinite regress in the notions, therefore, is commenced.

one feature is the only way a notion can escape falling under either the one or the other of the two extremes, univocity and pure equivocity. To fall into the area dealt with by the present discussion, the one notion must exercise both functions. It has to both unite and differentiate without the aid of any other concept. In approaching God from creatures against this background, there is no question of taking a concept that is univocally common to God and creatures, and crossing it with another univocal concept that restricts its extension to God. That is the procedure of Duns Scotus.<sup>24</sup> To speak of God and his perfections without univocity means, on the contrary, that each of the concepts used is of itself different while of itself the same, in its respective application to God and to creatures.

## II

The accepted Latin equivalent for the Greek *analogia*, in classical Latin, in St. Augustine, and among the Scholastics,<sup>25</sup> was *proportio*. But *proportio*, just as "proportion" in English, could mean a two-term relation. You may say, for instance, that the proportion of three to six is half. From the meaning of this mathematical relation *proportio* was given the transferred sense of any relation whatsoever between two things, according to the mediaeval understanding of the term:

... proportio secundum primam nominis institutionem significat habitudinem quantitatis ad quantitatem secundum aliquem determinatum excessum vel adaequationem; sed ulterius est translatus ad significandum omnem habitudinem cuiuscumque ad aliud.<sup>26</sup>

In consequence, the two-term relation came to be viewed simply as a *proportio*, and a new name was required for the four-term relation in the original Aristotelian analogy. Regarded as a likeness of proportions, the four-term type was called proportionality.<sup>27</sup> Hence arose the technical designation "analogy of proportionality." According to the

<sup>24</sup> Texts of Duns Scotus illustrating this way of forming concepts about God may be found collected in my study 'Up to What Point is God included in the Metaphysics of Duns Scotus?', *Mediaeval Studies*, X (1948), 165-172.

<sup>25</sup> See J. M. Ramírez, 'De Analogia secundum Doctrinam Aristotelico-Thomisticam,' *La Ciencia Tomista*, XXIV (1921), 22-23, footnotes, for some instances.

<sup>26</sup> St. Thomas, *In IV Sent.*, d. 49, q. 2, a. 1, ad 6m; ed. Vivès, XI, 485a (*ST*, Suppl., 92, 1, ad 6m). Cf.: "... proportio dicitur dupliciter. Uno modo, certa habitudo unius quantitatis ad alteram; secundum quod duplum, triplum, et aequale, sunt species proportionis. Alio modo, quaelibet habitudo unius ad alterum proportio dicitur." *ST*, I, 12, 1, ad 4m.

<sup>27</sup> See St. Thomas, *De Ver.*, II, 11c.

Aristotelian analysis, four-term analogy could be the foundation of metaphorical predication: "That from analogy is possible whenever there are four terms so related that the second (B) is to the first (A), as the fourth (D) to the third (C); for one may then metaphorically put D in lieu of B, and B in lieu of D."<sup>28</sup> In metaphor the sense of one term is transferred to the sense of another, on the basis of the analogy. In the predication "Lindbergh was an eagle," the sense of "eagle" is transferred to the sense of "intrepid flier," on the ground of the relations of Lindbergh and an eagle to their respective ways of flying. In this type of analogy the proper sense of the predicate is not applied to the other term. "Metaphorically" is thus opposed to "properly" by Cajetan,<sup>29</sup> and accordingly with John of St. Thomas metaphor becomes known technically as "analogy of improper or metaphorical proportionality,"<sup>30</sup> in contrast to "analogy of proper proportionality," in which there is no transference of sense.

The historical development of the terms "analogy of proper proportionality" and "analogy of improper proportionality," therefore, should make clear the force of the terms "proper" and "improper." These characteristics do not apply to the analogy itself. In both cases there is four-term analogy, fully in agreement with the original mathematical model. Both are properly analogy. The designations "proper" and "improper" in these expressions affect only the sense in which one of the terms is applied. The contrast is between the proper sense of that term, and a transferred sense. But both types exhibit the original notion of 'analogy' in as proper a sense as the notion can have outside the mathematical order.

What help can four-term analogy offer for the Thomistic explanation of being? Three ways have been proposed. One is the explanation of the divine being through analogy with essence and existence in creatures. The other is the investigation of accidents as analogous with substance, again in terms of essence and being. The third is the inquiry into the perfections contained in subsistent being, through analogy with the

<sup>28</sup> Aristotle, *Po.*, 21,1457b16-19; Oxford tr. R. R. Boyle, 'The Nature of Metaphor,' *The Modern Schoolman*, XXXI (1954), 274-275, would reject this traditional basis of metaphor, on the claim that metaphor is "a denial of all analogy." However true this claim may be from the viewpoint of external literary form, philosophically the transfer of sense in metaphor is made clearly on the basis of analogy. From a philosophical standpoint, therefore, no hesitation need arise about regarding metaphor as a type of analogy. Cf. discussion in *The Modern Schoolman*, XXXIV (1957), 283-301.

<sup>29</sup> *De Nominum Analogia*, c. III, (ed. Zammit) no. 25.

<sup>30</sup> *Ars Logica*, II, 13, 3; ed. Reiser, I, 484b38-40.

perfections found in creatures. Are any or all of these applications of analogy justifiable from the viewpoint of metaphysics?

The first application of the four-term analogy would run: "As a creature is to its being, so is God to his proper being." The difficulty lies in the number of terms. Are they four, or are they really only three? A creature is other than its being, and so gives rise to two really distinct and proportional terms. But are God and his being two distinct terms? In reality they are but the one term, for they are strictly identical. Even the concepts of the divine essence and the divine being exhibit no intrinsic distinction. Intrinsically the concept of the divine essence contains being and nothing else — *esse tantum*. The only difference here is in the words used to express them, a difference that arises not from anything in the divine essence and being, but just from the difference between essence and being in creatures. There is of course no question here of the verbal expression "divine essence" as analogous to the verbal expression "divine being." The problem concerns at least the content of the two concepts. Their content is intrinsically identical, and not at all proportional. There are only three terms, and the three are not arranged in a way that would allow one to function as two, according to the model "three is to six as six is to twelve." The single term is not shared by both couplets, but would have to function as both terms in one of the couplets. The model would then become "three is to six as twelve is to twelve." It obviously does not work. Rather, one would say that twelve is related to twelve quite differently from any proportional way. It is identical with itself, not proportional to itself. Identity does not set up one of the two proportions required by the Scholastic notion of proportionality, namely a similarity of proportions.

At any rate, in a passage that has left itself open to different interpretations from the viewpoint of analogy, St. Thomas sharply distinguishes the identity of God with his being from the relation of creatures to their being:

Deus autem alio modo se habet ad esse quam aliqua alia creatura; nam ipse est suum esse, quod nulli alii creaturae competit.<sup>31</sup>

Since the text has been read to mean that God is related proportionally to his being as creatures are to theirs, and in quite opposite fashion to signify that God is not related to his existence proportionally, as creatures are, the interpretation has to be thrown back upon the overall

<sup>31</sup> *De Pot.*, VII, 7c.



notions involved in the statement. Certainly identity is a relation for St. Thomas.<sup>32</sup> There is no difficulty in translating the *se habet* in the sense that God is related to his own being because he is identical with it. But can it mean that he is proportional to his being? According to the etymology of *proportio* and according to the mathematical examples given to illustrate it, this interpretation is impossible. Proportion seems from its very notion to require difference in the proportional terms, for instance in three as half of six. There does not seem to be any use of the word that would allow three to be proportional to three, or six to be proportional to six. Yet the requirement for the Scholastic analogy of proportionality was a likeness of proportions. In the present case one of the required proportions is lacking. There does not seem any possibility, then, of predicating being of God and creatures by analogy of proportionality, as proportionality was understood by St. Thomas.<sup>33</sup>

It is clear, moreover, that in this case analogy cannot be a means of increasing knowledge about God. It has to presuppose that three of the terms are already known, namely creatures, their being, and God. The fourth term will be identical with the third, since God is identical with his being. The knowledge of both the essence and the existence of God is presupposed by this attempted analogy. It cannot result in new knowledge, in imitation of a mathematical model like "two is to four as six is to  $x$ ."

Is the second application of analogy of proportionality, namely in the case of substance and accidents, possible with regard to the predication of being? If each accident, including relation, has its own proper act of existing, corresponding to its essence and really distinct from its essence and from the being of the substance on which it depends,<sup>34</sup> there is hardly

<sup>32</sup> "...relatio identitatis, quae distinctionem operari non potest, sicut dicitur idem eidem idem." CG, IV, 10, Nam relatio. Cf. ST, I, 28, 1, ad 2m; In V Metaph., lect. 11, (ed. Cathala-Spiazzi) no. 912.

<sup>33</sup> So Lyttkens, p. 475, n. 6; M. S. O'Neill, 'Some Remarks on the Analogy of God and Creatures in St. Thomas Aquinas,' *Mediaeval Studies*, XXIII (1961), pp. 208-209. For the contrary view and interpretation of the text, see James F. Anderson, *The Bond of Being* (St. Louis, 1949), 293-294; 'Some Basic Propositions concerning Metaphysical Analogy,' *The Review of Metaphysics*, V (1952), 470-472.

<sup>34</sup> The present reaction against Cajetan and Bañez goes to a seemingly unwarranted extreme in claiming that a real distinction between an accident's being and the being of the substance in which the accident inheres was unknown to St. Thomas; e.g., Cornelio Fabro, 'L'Obscurcissement de l' 'Esse' dans l'Ecole Thomiste,' *Revue Thomiste*, LVIII (1958), pp. 460-465. See also other instances listed in J. S. Albertson, 'The *Esse* of Accidents according to St. Thomas,' *The Modern Schoolman*, XXX (1953), pp. 271-272, n. 14. To maintain that being is really distinct from thing in creatures, however, does not at all mean

any problem. There will always be the four terms, the proportion between the two terms in each set, and the required likeness between the proportions. As substance is to its being, so is quality to qualitative being:

... *vel unum analogia* seu proportione, sicut substantia et qualitas in ente: quia *sicut* se habet substantia ad esse sibi debitum, *ita* et qualitas ad esse sui generis conveniens.<sup>35</sup>

The same holds in regard to the other accidents, even in the case of relations:

In nobis enim relationes habent esse dependens, quia earum esse est aliud ab esse substantiae: unde habent proprium modum essendi secundum propriam rationem, sicut et in aliis accidentibus contingit.<sup>36</sup>

The reason for the ever present proportionality throughout the categories is the key Thomistic doctrine that finite form always limits and specifies a produced act of being:

Quia enim forma est principium essendi, necesse est quod secundum quamlibet formam habitam, habens aliquid esse dicatur. ... Si vero sit talis forma quae sit extranea ab essentia habentis eam, secundum illam formam non dicetur esse simpliciter, sed esse aliquid: sicut secundum albedinem homo dicitur esse albus: ...<sup>37</sup>

According to this overall doctrine, the kind of being a thing has is determined by its substantial form and its accidental forms. The being, accordingly, corresponds to the form it actuates. Knowing that an existent substance is extended, you know thereby that it has an added accidental act of being that corresponds to its quantity. You can conclude that the accidental being is other than the substantial being, because the accidental being is proportional to and determined by the accidental form, while the substantial being is proportional to the substantial form. In this way analogy of proportionality is a means of increasing metaphysical knowledge.

an obligation to regard created being as a *res* in the fashion of Giles of Rome. Nor does it mean that all created being is substantial being. The *inesse* of an accident is a real existential act really distinct from substantial being as well as from accidental essence. It cannot make the essence it actuates exist in the manner of a substance, though such seems to be the view of the opponents here; e.g., "This second *esse* is not a second act of existing; that would make the accident into a substance joined to another." Clifford G. Kossel, 'Principles of St. Thomas's Distinction between the *Esse* and *Ratio* of Relation,' *The Modern Schoolman*, XXIV (1947), 93, n. 4.

<sup>35</sup> St. Thomas, *In III Sent.*, d. 1, q. 1, a. 1, Resp.; ed. Moos, III, 8 (no. 12).

<sup>36</sup> CG, IV, 14, (Leonine manual) no. 7c.

<sup>37</sup> *In Boeth. De Hebdom.*, c. II; ed. Mandonnet, *Opusc.*, I, 174.

The notion of being that is so established throughout the categories by analogy of proportionality is quite evidently neither univocal nor purely equivocal. The one notion, namely actuation of essence, is present in all instances. There is accordingly the required similarity of proportions. But "actuation of essence" has its formal determination from the essence itself, and so differs with each formal difference of essence. There can be no question of its being the same in one notion and different in another notion, since every form, as the above text makes clear, is just by itself a formal determinant of being. The same notion, accordingly, exhibits both the likeness and the difference. It belongs in the area between univocity and pure equivocality. It is, moreover, a notion that is superior to all its instances, even though it is shared primarily by substance and by the other instances secondarily and in dependence upon substance.

Finally, there is the application of analogy of proportionality to make explicit the perfections of subsistent being. If unity, truth, goodness, and beauty are shown to follow inevitably upon being and to correspond to the being a thing has, subsistent being will possess these characteristics in the highest degree, because it is being in the highest degree. Further, since the perfection of a thing corresponds to its being, no perfection of anything will be lacking in subsistent being.<sup>38</sup> If the perfection contains no defect or imperfection in its proper notion, like goodness or intelligence, it is predicated of God in its proper sense. If its notion, on the other hand, involves limitation or imperfection, like hearing or feeling, it has to be applied to God in a transferred sense that involves no limitation. In the second case the proportionality is that of metaphor.<sup>39</sup> Even if a perfection with no limitation in its own notion, like truth, is applied to God in the limited sense in which it is found in creatures, there is only a metaphor.<sup>40</sup>

This method of analogy undoubtedly yields much positive knowledge of God. It shows how innumerable divine perfections follow upon the divine being. It establishes the divine attributes. Through metaphor it expresses the divine nature and qualities in the appealing way that is so important for religious and moral life. Yet the reservations are drastic. Always the third term of the analogy, namely God himself, remains in one sense utterly unknown. In the same sense the fourth term of the analogy, that is, the divine perfection that is reached through the analogy with creatures, will likewise remain utterly un-

<sup>38</sup> St. Thomas, *ST*, I, 4, 2c.

<sup>39</sup> *De Ver.*, II, 11c.

<sup>40</sup> *De Ver.*, I, 7c.

known. Metaphysical reasoning shows that the existence known through judgment in a sensible thing is caused efficiently by something else and ultimately by subsistent being.<sup>41</sup> The reasoning is based not upon anything known quidditatively through the first operation of the mind, simple apprehension, but upon an act that is known by way of an active synthesizing in the second operation of the mind and not at all in the manner of a still life object able to serve as a starting point for quidditative knowledge.<sup>42</sup> The result is the anomaly that the metaphysician knows with certainty that God exists without knowing his existence, for the divine existence is the divine essence.<sup>43</sup> That God exists, is a quiddity. But creatures provide no starting point for knowing it as a quiddity. Yet every perfection in God is his existing:

Quidquid autem est in Deo, hoc est suum proprium esse; sicut enim essentia in eo est idem quod esse, ita scientia idem est quod scientem esse in eo; unde, cum esse quod est proprium unius rei non possit alteri communicari, impossibile est quod creatura pertingat ad eandem rationem habendi aliquid quod habet Deus; sicut impossibile est quod ad idem esse perveniat.<sup>44</sup>

Every perfection in God, then, is as utterly unknowable to men as is his being. Hence arises the peculiar situation that one can know that God is good, in the proper sense of the notion "good," without having even the faintest notion of what goodness in God is, just as one does not know at all what the divine existence is. Similarly one can know that God is truth, that he is intelligence, that he is wise, and so on, all according to the proper notions of these attributes, without having the least notion of what they are on the divine level. The positive theology has to be complemented everywhere by the concomitant negative theology:

... et iterum cognoscitur *per ignorantiam* nostram, inquantum scilicet hoc ipsum est Deum cognoscere, quod nos scimus nos ignorare de Deo quid sit.<sup>45</sup>

Needless to say, the same holds all the more for metaphor, in which the notion is applied not in its proper meaning but only in a transferred sense.

<sup>41</sup> *De Ente*, c. IV; ed. Roland-Gosselin, pp. 34.7-35.16. *ST*, I, 2, 3c (2a via).

<sup>42</sup> See J. Owens, 'Diversity and Community of Being in St. Thomas Aquinas,' *Mediaeval Studies*, XXII (1960), pp. 284-297.

<sup>43</sup> *CG*, I, 12; *ST*, I, 2, 1c; I, 3, 4, ad 2m. Cf. "penitus (utterly—tr. English Dominican Fathers) manet ignotum," *CG*, III, 49, Cognoscit; "omnino ignotum," *In Epist. ad Rom.*, I, 6 (ed. Vivès, XX, 398b).

<sup>44</sup> *De Ver.*, II, 11c.

<sup>45</sup> *In De Div. Nom.*, c. VII, lect. 4, (ed. Pera) no. 731. In this regard the pertinent texts of St. Thomas have to be interpreted "not in the order of the quidditative concept, but in that of judgment." E. Gilson, *The Christian Philosophy of St. Thomas Aquinas*, p. 106.

## III

In classical Latin, *analogia* retained the status of a term borrowed from the Greek. With *proportio* handed down as its equivalent, however, it was easily acclimatized in mediaeval Scholasticism in the same meanings as *proportio*, namely as a definite relation of one quantity to another, and then as any relation of one thing to another.<sup>46</sup> Accordingly it was at hand to designate the two-term relations involved in the Aristotelian predication by reference to one nature (*pros hen*). These relations could be that of cause to effect, as a medicine is healthy because it causes health. They could be that of sign to thing signified, as a color is healthy because it is a sign of health. They could be that of effect to cause, as a treatise is medical because it proceeds from medical art.<sup>47</sup> In every case, however, the relation was two-term. With *proportio* understood in this sense, *proportionalitas* was required to designate the four-term relation. Against this background the two-term kind was regarded as analogy of proportion and the other type as analogy of proportionality.<sup>48</sup> For the same reason the two-term sort was called analogy of simple proportion, in contrast to the multiple proportions involved in proportionality. In the Latin Averroes,<sup>49</sup> the Aristotelian predication by reference had been described as *per attributionem*. In consequence "analogy of attribution" also became an accepted Scholastic designation for this type. As the Aristotelian example of "health" made the denominating form extrinsic to all but its primary instance, the denomination through reference to it was regarded by St. Thomas as *ab aliquo extrinseco*, in contrast to denomination *ab aliqua forma sibi inherente*, as in the case of secondary instances of the good.<sup>50</sup> Against this background, in the wake of the Suaresian emphasis on the intrinsic participation of being, the designation "analogy of intrinsic attribution" was coined for the latter type.

A sharp difference may be expected between the way in which a thing is denominated from an intrinsic characteristic and the way in which it

<sup>46</sup> On these meanings of *proportio*, see *supra*, nn. 25-26.

<sup>47</sup> See St. Thomas, *In XI Metaph.*, lect. 3, (ed. Cathala-Spiazzi) nos. 2196-2197.

<sup>48</sup> *De Ver.*, II, 11c.

<sup>49</sup> Averroes, *In IV Metaph.*, comm. 2, (Venice, 1574) fol. 66rl (B).

<sup>50</sup> St. Thomas, *De Ver.*, XXI, 4, ad 2m. Cf. ad 3m, and the end of the corpus of the article; also *In I Eth.*, lect. 7, (ed. Pirotta) no. 96. On the use of the Aristotelian model "healthy" in St. Thomas, see W. W. Meissner, 'Some Notes on a Figure in St. Thomas,' *The New Scholasticism*, XXXI (1957), 68-84.

is denominated from an extrinsic nature, even through in both cases the denomination is made in reference to a primary instance. In the one case the reference itself is not the notion predicated. In the other case, namely the extrinsic, the notion predicated is exactly the reference :

... dupliciter denominatur aliquid per respectum ad alterum. Uno modo quando ipse respectus est ratio denominationis,... et in talibus, quod denominatur per respectum ad alterum, non denominatur ab aliqua forma sibi inhaerente, sed ab aliquo extrinseco ad quod refertur. Alio modo denominatur aliquid per respectum ad alterum, quando respectus non est ratio denominationis, sed causa; ... et hoc modo creatura dicitur bona per respectum ad bonum;...<sup>51</sup>

What does this mean? According to the Aristotelian illustration, "health," the reference to a primary nature is the notion predicated of the secondary instances. When you say that spinach is healthy, you mean "Spinach is a cause of health." Spinach is considered to be related to health as the cause of health. Exactly that reference "cause" is what you predicate in this instance, as even the structure of the sentence "Spinach is a cause — of health" shows. The relation of cause is in the spinach and so can be a notion predicated of it. But in a mess of cooked spinach there is nothing that even remotely enjoys health. The denomination, accordingly, is from the extrinsic primary instance to which the spinach is referred when it is called healthy as a cause of health, but the notion predicated is the reference itself. What is predicated is "health-causing," not "health," though the denomination is of course from "health."

On the other hand, the denominating notion itself is predicated when it expresses a characteristic intrinsic to the secondary instances, like goodness in creatures. In this case the reference is not the notion predicated but rather the cause of what the notion expresses. When a sensible thing's goodness is understood as a participation of the primary good, it is known as good through reference to something else, and yet as possessing inherent goodness. Its own inherent goodness is here the notion predicated of it, though with the understanding that it is participated goodness. The reference to the primary instance is not what is predicated, as it was in the previous case. When you say "My Cadillac is good," the notion you are predicating is not "participation," as was the notion "cause" in "Spinach is healthy." The notion you are predicating now is "good." But when you realize that the Cadillac, despite its perfection, has only participated goodness, you are

<sup>51</sup> St. Thomas, *De Ver.*, XXI, 4, ad 2m.

understanding the predicate "good" in reference to its exemplar and efficient cause, somewhat as Plato understood things in the light of Ideas:

... unde si prima bonitas sit effectiva omnium bonorum, oportet quod similitudinem suam imprimat in rebus effectis; et sic unumquodque dicitur bonum sicut forma inherente per similitudinem summi boni sibi inditam, et ulterius per bonitatem primam, sicut per exemplar et effectivum omnis bonitatis creatae. Quantum ad hoc opinio Platonis sustineri potest.<sup>52</sup>

Where a cause leaves its likeness impressed upon its effects, therefore, it produces the ground for reference on the basis of an inherent characteristic. In this way the being of secondary instances is an imitation of the primary being. The same holds for the other characteristics of creatures:

... non communitate univocationis sed analogiae. Talis autem communitas potest esse duplex. Aut ex eo quod aliqua participant aliquid unum secundum prius et posterius, sicut potentia et actus rationem entis, et similiter substantia et accedens; aut ex eo quod unum esse et rationem ab altero recipit; et talis est analogia creaturae ad Creatorem: creatura enim non habet esse nisi secundum quod a primo ente descendit, nec nominatur ens nisi inquantum ens primum imitatur; et similiter est de sapientia et de omnibus aliis quae de creatura dicuntur.<sup>53</sup>

Being, accordingly, is found in all created things as an imitation of the first being. Being, therefore, and not the reference to their cause, is the notion predicated of them. As the imitations are of various degrees, they are differentiated as imitations. There is no difficulty then in placing this type of predication in the area between univocity and pure equivocity, for the likeness and the difference are both found in the one characteristic. The primary instance is not an inferior of the characteristics, but is the characteristic itself. The secondary instances, however, are the characteristic's inferiors, even though there is order of prior and subsequent in their partaking of it. Accordingly God does not come under the common notion of being, but substance and accidents do:

Sed duplex est analogia. Quaedam secundum convenientiam in aliquo uno quod eis per prius et posterius convenit; et haec analogia non potest esse inter Deum et creaturam, sicut nec univocatio. Alia analogia est, secundum quod unum imitatur aliud quantum potest, nec perfecte ipsum assequitur; et haec analogia est creaturae ad Deum.<sup>54</sup>

<sup>52</sup> *De Ver.*, XXI, 4c.

<sup>53</sup> *In I Sent.*, Prol., q. 1, a. 2, ad 2m; ed. Mandonnet, I, 10.

<sup>54</sup> *In I Sent.*, d. 35, q. 1, a. 4, Solut.; ed. Mandonnet, I, 820.

Being, then, is an inherent characteristic in all its secondary instances. In all these instances it exhibits an imitation in various degrees of its primary instance. Since some knowledge of a thing can be gained from its likenesses, created things provide in this way a means of knowing their creator.<sup>55</sup> But the same caution as before is necessary. In the procedure from effects to cause God is reached as being only, for he is reached as one whose nature is to be. But the human mind has no proper quidditative concept of being. It knows being originally through judgment, and then conceptualizes it under the common notions of act or perfection. But it is not conceived under any concept proper to being. Hence on the basis of the imitations in creatures one can know that God exists and that he has all their perfections, without knowing what the divine existence is or what the perfections are in God.

With this important reservation, however, the ways to God from imitations in creatures may readily be seen to occupy the basic place in metaphysical procedure. Through them the existence and nature of God are reached, as far as is possible for unaided human reason, and the third term is thereby provided for reasoning about the divine attributes through proportionality. But may the two-term relation be designated as "analogy" in English? The *Oxford English Dictionary* (s.v.) lists as obsolete the use of the term to express the correspondence or proportion of one thing to another. There is no harm in using an obsolete word to render in English the technical designation of a mediaeval Scholastic procedure. Any other way of translating it in the texts of St. Thomas would be intolerable. But once "analogy of attribution," "analogy of simple proportion," and "analogy of proportion" are conceded as technical terms, can the further English vocabulary of analogy be used meaningfully in their regard? Can you say, with any meaning, in English, that spinach is analogous to health because it is the cause of health? Can you say that a rosy color in the cheeks is analogous to bodily health because it is a sign of health? Can you say that a scalpel and surgical art are analogous as instrument and skill? These are instances of extrinsic attribution. But does intrinsic similarity fare any better? Would you say there is an analogy between a son and a father because of their similarity in looks or character? Is an imitation leather purse described as analogous to a genuine one? In present day

<sup>55</sup> See *De Pot.*, VII, 7. In *De Ver.*, II, 11, any *determinata habitudo* is denied between creatures and God. The reason is that the creature is finite, while God is infinite (*ibid.*, arg. 2m). The effects are "non proportionatos causae" (*ST*, I, 2, 2, ad 3m), and so do not provide perfect knowledge of the cause.



English, rather, the vocabulary of analogy is at home only in the four-term relations.<sup>56</sup>

#### IV

Finally, there are types of equivocity that do not in any way come under the caption "analogy," and nevertheless are applied to being. St. Thomas writes of Avicenna:

Similiter etiam deceptus est ex aequivocatione entis. Nam ens quod significat compositionem propositionis est praedicatum accidentale,... Sed ens quod dividitur per decem praedicamenta, significat ipsas naturas decem generum secundum quod sunt actu vel potentia.<sup>57</sup>

Here the equivocity is in the notion of being as existential act and as the nature that possesses or is able to possess existential act. Both thing and existential act are called being (*ens*). No attempt is made to name this "analogy." One could hardly say that an existent thing is analogous to its own existence. Even before it exists one would not speak of an analogy between it and its existence. But there is not pure equivocity either, for a thing is called a being obviously on account of its relation to its being. It is a type of mixed equivocity, and yet is not analogy.

The difference in status between a thing in act and a thing in potency, mentioned in the preceding text, is listed by Aristotle as one of the ways in which a notion may take on various meanings. It is a way expressly applied by him to being.<sup>58</sup> Another way is the predication of the same term essentially and accidentally. This likewise is applied to being.<sup>59</sup>

<sup>56</sup> The restriction of "analogy" to four-term relations opens the problem of a suitable term to cover the whole area between univocity and pure equivocity. There are a number available, e.g., systematic ambiguity, equivocity (by design), multisignificance, multivalence, and so on. "Equivocity" corresponds to the traditional Boethian nomenclature. It does not seem to have recognized uses outside the present context, and so does not give rise to confusion. "Equivocal" is as wide in meaning as "ambiguous," and is not restricted in English to pure equivocity. The connotations of deliberate deception arising from the use of "equivocate" and "equivocation" in the moral field need not enter into the metaphysical area. Even these terms, however, do not necessarily imply pure equivocity, as can be seen in the difference between the conventional "I do not know" in the sense of non-professional knowledge, and "But I already have a date for tonight" with the meaning of one in the ice-box for the evening snack. Nor does the effort to get a suitable notion to cover the whole area mean that all the types are brought under a univocal concept, any more than the one concept of pure equivocity makes its various instances univocal.

<sup>57</sup> *In X Metaph.*, lect. 3, (ed. Cathala-Spiazzi) no. 1892.

<sup>58</sup> Aristotle, *Metaph.*,  $\Delta$  7,1017a35-b8; E 2,1026b1-2.

<sup>59</sup> *Ibid.*, 1017a7-22; 1026a33-34.

In St. Thomas this latter way takes on a special significance, since being is both accidental and essential to all its secondary instances.<sup>60</sup>

In neither of these ways does the predication take place by pure equivocity. A possible dollar and an actual dollar are not called by the same name merely through chance. Nor is it just by chance that the one word "is" finds itself used to say that Socrates is a man and that Socrates is cultured. In both cases "is" expresses a synthesis of Socrates with a form, in one case an essential synthesis, in the other case an accidental synthesis. There is partial sameness and partial difference in the one notion of being, as it is used of the actual and the potential, and of the essential and accidental. Yet this partial sameness and partial difference is not called "analogy." A like situation is found with regard to being in the sense of truth.<sup>61</sup>

## V

This very general survey of the wide territory between univocity and pure equivocity seems to show that it cannot be covered by the one notion "analogy." Analogy and its vocabulary are perfectly at home in the area of four-term relations, whether the notion at issue keeps its proper sense or is applied through metaphor in a transferred sense. In predication through reference, where only two terms are involved, the designation "analogy of attribution" is the technical Scholastic term. But in English, this implies an obsolete use of the word "analogy," and does not allow the current vocabulary of analogy to express its meaning. To continue regarding it as "analogy," then, except in the sense of a mediaeval *cliché* that has no bearing on the present use of language, can hardly help but engender confusion. It will be expected to function as analogy, and yet will not be able to do so in the current understanding of the vocabulary. Other types of partial sameness and partial difference

<sup>60</sup> On this topic, see my article "The Accidental and Essential Character of Being in the Doctrine of St. Thomas Aquinas," *Mediaeval Studies*, XX (1958), 140.

<sup>61</sup> Aristotle, loc. cit., 1017a31-35; 1026a34-35. The complicated situation that results from trying to reduce this type and equivocity through act and potency to "analogy," may be seen in Klubertanz, pp. 140-141. In neither case does the reduction seem to be without remainder. To say that a house is ashes and smoke because it can be burned into them, expresses something that eludes the traditional Scholastic types of *analogia*; and the still life "being as truth" in the reflexive simple apprehension of the intellect differs from the active synthesizing grasped through judgment, in a way that is over and above their subsequent-prior relation and is not expressed by it. Further types of equivocity are required to cover these situations.

in the one notion, types that are important for the explanation of being, do not come even traditionally under the designation of analogy.

Analogy therefore is quite restricted in its role as an approach to the Thomistic doctrine of being. In its unchallenged sense, namely in the area of four-term relations, it does not seem to function as a means of explaining the divine being, though it does play its part in the understanding of the divine attributes, and in penetrating the recesses of predicamental being. If the name "analogy" is accepted, in the fashion of the mediaeval Scholastics, as a designation for predication through reference, it denominates a way of reaching the divine being as well as the divine attributes, and provides help in understanding the order of prior and subsequent in the categories of being. But in this case the title "analogy" has to be separated from its use in current English, in order to avoid confusion of thought. Finally, even when with these reservations one includes predication through reference under the term "analogy," there are still other types of partial sameness and partial difference that have to be used in the Thomistic explanation of being. Analogy is an important part of the approach to being in St. Thomas, but it is not the whole approach. In fact, it is very far from covering the whole approach. If it is to continue in use as a vague designation for the entire area between univocity and pure equivocality, in the Thomistic approach to being, it should be employed with full consciousness of its various degrees of ineptitude for functioning outside the fields of proportionality. Cajetan, still writing in Scholastic Latin, has been dubbed anachronistic for restricting analogy proper to its ancient Greek sense.<sup>62</sup> Those who write in present-day English, however, might help avoid unnecessary confusion if they kept the vocabulary of analogy within its current English use, except for expressions clearly earmarked as literal translations of mediaeval Scholastic *clichés*.

*Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies*

<sup>62</sup> See R. McNerny, 'The Logic of Analogy,' *The New Scholasticism*, XXXI (1957), p. 154, n. 12.

# On a Handlist of Saints' Lives in Old Norse

HANS BEKKER-NIELSEN

I SHALL be publishing in the next volume of *Mediaeval Studies* a handlist of all the Lives of the Saints written in Old Norse. Such a list will reveal not only the surprisingly large number of such Lives which have survived, but also, unless I am mistaken, provide scholars with a useful means of opening up, in a way hitherto impossible, the many problems which such texts entail. The present brief article serves to introduce the handlist now in course of preparation and to acknowledge the assistance of Dr. Ole Widding, Editor-in-Chief of the *Arnsmagnæan Dictionary of Old Norse*, and of Rev. L. K. Shook, President of the Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies.

The handlist will treat all the extant Saints' Lives in Old Norse, supplying accurate references to manuscripts and editions as well as other relevant references and notes. Details of the arrangement of materials in the list will be given below. The joint editors of the list share the responsibility for the format in which the materials are presented, and are making an effort to include all relevant references with as rigid an economy of space as consonant with a thorough investigation. Accordingly, the editors want to emphasize in advance that their work is not a history of hagiographic writings in Old Norse, but simply a handlist which seeks to record what has been done in this branch of literature. It is hoped that the handlist will, by offering a convenient general view of the materials, also indicate what remains to be done in this field. The editors in Copenhagen share the responsibility for the selection of Old Norse texts to be included in the list.

Unfortunately Old Norse hagiography is a field often neglected by students of Old Norse language and literature, who have as a rule shown primary interest (and justly so) in the Icelandic sagas and in the Kings' sagas, with excursive sallies (sometimes both complex and mildly eccentric) into Eddic and Skaldic poetry. Native elements in Old Norse Literature have, naturally enough, attracted more notice among scholars than what have sometimes been felt to be the less endemic qualities of learned and ecclesiastical works based on or translated from foreign tongues, particularly Latin. However, some recent studies show that an appreciation of the translated literature is developing, along with the recognition that the steady influx of foreign literature into Norway and

Iceland helped to cultivate the literary taste of native scholars, and that early translations of religious literature (Saints' Lives and Homilies) afforded excellent training in literary composition. The translations had no little part in the formation of what is now usually regarded as an essential aspect of Old Norse literature. It must always be borne in mind that some of the sagas of holy men and women are quite old, anterior to most of the Icelandic sagas, and unquestionably important for their influence on the style and form of Old Norse writings. Turville-Petre has rightly remarked that "the learned literature did not teach the Icelanders what to think or what to say, but it taught them how to say it."<sup>1</sup>

Any student who becomes involved in a study of Old Norse hagiography will immediately meet the name of C. R. Unger (1817-1897). This great scholar made a lasting contribution to the study of religious literature in Old Norse by his useful editions which presented to the world of learning almost all the Saints' Lives surviving in classical Old Norse. His two collections known as *Postola Sögur* (Christiania 1874) and *Heilagra Manna Sögur* (two volumes, Christiania 1877) are still indispensable for scholars who are interested in Old Norse hagiography. References to these editions as well as others of Unger's editions in this field will of course be given in the handlist. His introductions to the editions show Unger as an eminently sensible scholar who was able to divide his interest between linguistic and literary problems. His ability to give a short, but essential description of manuscripts was equalled by his understanding of the literary relation between the Old Norse sagas of holy men and women and their foreign (mostly Latin) sources. However, it goes without saying that later generations of scholars have now and again been able to supplement or correct Unger's statements, and that philologists to whom his editions amounted to little more than handy collections of linguistic exhibits, have criticized him for an apparent lack of accuracy. I want to stress that when we in the handlist modify or correct some of Unger's statements, we do this, not to belittle his work, but rather with a feeling that we are doing something which he would have done himself had he lived to see *Bibliotheca Hagiographica Latina* and other handbooks indispensable to modern scholars in this field.

It would be reasonable to expect that Unger's activity might have inspired literary historians to pay more attention than they have to the rich hagiographic literature surviving in Old Norse. Apart from the

<sup>1</sup> G. Turville-Petre, *Origins of Icelandic Literature* (Oxford, 1953) 142.

fact that there were too many other tempting problems to solve outside this special field, quite a number of scholars have apparently found the spiritual and devotional literature of the Middle Ages too naive to merit more than passing consideration. Finnur Jónsson (1858-1934), who was for almost fifty years the central figure of Old Norse studies, was probably speaking for most of his contemporaries, when he wrote that Saints' Lives "by their highly restrictive spiritual outlook, by their miracles and many monstrosities, contributed to the general dullness and superstition during the fifteenth and sixteenth century up to the Reformation."<sup>2</sup> This is but one example of Finnur Jónsson's frank opinions which, no matter how outrageous, never fail to delight his readers. One of his contemporaries did not share Jónsson's views, and in his history of Old Norse literature<sup>3</sup> Eugen Mogk (1854-1939) made an effort to treat the sagas of holy men and women adequately, and even suggested that it might be worth while to pursue the study further. Unfortunately Mogk's voice was not heard, at any rate not by Finnur Jónsson, for he repeated his dictum in the second edition of his great history of Old Norse literature (Copenhagen 1920-24).

That Jónsson's unsympathetic attitude towards hagiographic literature has not been totally damaging for the study of Saints' Lives in Old Norse, is to some degree owing to the perspicuity of Fredrik Paasche (1886-1943), who always emphasized the part played by Christianity in the mediaeval culture of Norway and Iceland in his studies of Old Norse literature. Paasche was a gifted scholar with a keen appreciation of the European, we might almost say universal, outlook in so much of the religious or semi-religious literature in Old Norse. He has had a lasting influence on many scholars in the same fields, even if some of them are admittedly not too eager to acknowledge it. The history of Old Norse literature written by Fredrik Paasche<sup>4</sup> is still the best all-round introduction to this literature, and the most charming. It was a serious loss to Old Norse scholarship that Paasche died before he had written his chapters on religious and learned writings in the history of Old Norse literature, which were to have been done in collaboration with Jón Helgason and Sigurður Nordal. As the work now stands, the survey of the prose literature (done by Nordal, the general

<sup>2</sup> Finnur Jónsson, *Den oldnorske og oldislandske litteraturs historie* (Copenhagen, 1898-1901) II, 874.

<sup>3</sup> *Geschichte der norwegisch-isländischen Literatur*, 2nd. edition (Strassburg, 1904), also in *Grundriss der Germanischen Philologie*, 2nd edition (Strassburg, 1901-1909) II, 1, 555-923.

<sup>4</sup> Fredrik Paasche, *Norges og Islands litteratur inntil utgangen av middelalderen* (in *Norsk litteraturhistorie* I) 2nd edition, by Anne Holtsmark (Oslo, 1957).

editor of the volume), neglects the learned literature almost completely. It should be said, however, that Nordal makes very handsome apologies for the shortcomings of his survey in the preface.<sup>5</sup>

In the same year as Helgason's and Nordal's book was published, G. Turville-Petre published his introduction to Old Norse literature<sup>6</sup> with special stress on the early stages of Icelandic and Norwegian literature. In my opinion Turville-Petre's book gives the fullest and on the whole the most satisfying account of ecclesiastical writings, duly emphasizing the prominence of this branch of Old Norse literature. When this has been said, I must confess that I am a little disappointed by the author's apparent lack of interest in specifically Norwegian contributions to Old Norse literature. Perhaps this is an irrelevant objection to a book called *Origins of Icelandic Literature*, when, as must be admitted, it is usually impossible to demonstrate beyond dispute whether a given work originated in Norway or Iceland, and when in any event the greater part of the literature is preserved almost entirely in Icelandic manuscripts. Since Turville-Petre does not deal here with the later centuries of Old Norse literature, it is to be hoped that he will some day follow up his investigations of the earlier centuries with a continuation along the same lines. His *Origins* and his shorter papers on Old Norse literature (some of them in *Mediaeval Studies*<sup>7</sup>) suggest that he is the most likely candidate among contemporary scholars for Fredrik Paasche's throne.

In recent years the study of Old Norse hagiography has resulted in a number of smaller studies, some of them of considerable interest. The most recent contribution (to be published in 1962) is Peter G. Foote's introduction to the photographic edition of a fourteenth century collection of sagas of holy men and women, *Holm 2 fol.*, an Icelandic manuscript now in the Royal Library, Stockholm<sup>8</sup>. There is thus no need to bewail the lack of scholarly activity in this field just now, but nevertheless it would be highly desirable if more scholars would interest themselves in the hagiographic literature in Old Norse. We hope especially that scholars outside the small band of Scandinavian philologists can be persuaded to look at this comparatively rich literature from the outside, and thus contribute to a better understanding of the

<sup>5</sup> *Nordisk Kultur VIII: B, Litteraturhistorie B Norge og Island* (Stockholm, Oslo, Copenhagen, 1953).

<sup>6</sup> See above, note 1.

<sup>7</sup> *Mediaeval Studies* IX, (1947) 131-140; XI (1949) 206-218.

<sup>8</sup> *Early Icelandic Manuscripts in Facsimile IV* (Copenhagen, 1962).

spiritual climate of mediaeval Norway and Iceland. Perhaps our handlist of Saints' Lives in Old Norse will stimulate such studies.

I hope I am not being unfair to scholars who have worked or are working seriously in this field if I suggest that it is still too early to make a really comprehensive study of the origins and development of hagiographic literature in Old Norse. A multitude of minor problems have first to be solved. However, the recent contributions by Turville-Petre, Peter G. Foote and others show that the time is not far off when such a project can be safely undertaken. The following summary is accordingly only offered as a mere sketch of the history of Old Norse hagiography, as I see it. The term "Old Norse" in the present context embraces both Old Norwegian (till about 1370) and Old Icelandic (until 1540), that is, the period covered by the Arnamaganean Dictionary. The merit of this term lies mostly in its vagueness, for in quite a number of cases, as I have already mentioned, it is difficult to know exactly whether the saga of any given saint was first written in Norway or in Iceland. Teasing questions of this kind can only be answered by a closer linguistic and palaeographic examination of the manuscripts than has thus far been made, along with a more profound assessment of the general background.

It is not surprising that we should find Saints' Lives among the earliest specimens of Old Norse literature, for they had a natural place in the Christian education of the Icelanders and Norwegians, even though by European standards they had been converted to Christianity rather late. The conversion of Iceland took place in the year 1000, and paganism was not finally conquered in Norway until some time in the eleventh century. Yet it is remarkable how much of the literature in the oldest Norwegian and Icelandic manuscripts is of an edifying nature (Homilies, Saints' Lives, etc.); the clergy obviously felt an obligation to provide for their congregations a literature that was both instructive and entertaining. The translators of the early pioneering period, the twelfth and perhaps already in the eleventh century, probably felt a fraternal duty to cater to those of their brethren in orders who did not handle Latin with complete ease. Early specimens of hagiographic literature are found in *AM* 655, 4°, *fragm. IX*, one of the oldest manuscripts in Old Norse, if not the oldest, written in the Norwegian vernacular ca. 1150 or a little later, and *AM* 645, 4°, a manuscript from the first half of the thirteenth century, written in the Icelandic vernacular. *AM* 645, 4° has considerable local interest, since it contains a collection of miracles wrought by St. Thorlákr, the Icelandic bishop († 1193). Other Saints whose sagas come from this first hagiographic period of Scandinavia include: St. Placid, St. Blase, St. Martin, St. Ambrose, St. Basil the Great, St. Nicholas, and of course, the Apostles.



The earliest sagas of holy men and women are on the whole written in a plain straightforward style, remarkably free from influence of the diction in the Latin sources; in this they form a marked contrast to some of the contemporary (or slightly older) homilies in which literalness tends to dominate. In most cases the translation is close, but not strictly literal. I have already mentioned that the Saints' Lives from the formative years of Norse Letters were in turn to influence style and diction in the sagas of Icelanders; we do well then to look upon the translators of the oldest period as founders, but of course not the only founders, of Old Norse prose.

However, as time passed, a keener appreciation of the difference between religious and profane literature must have made itself felt, and ecclesiastical writers developed a taste for a learned and more elaborate style in Saints' Lives. The simplicity of the earlier period was more or less abandoned for a style in which the influence of the teaching of grammar, rhetoric, and dialectic in the Norwegian and Icelandic schools is obvious. We do not know exactly when or where this style originated, but we are justified in assuming that monasteries and other centres of learning played no little part in its increasing use. It is by no means unlikely that the famous monastery of Thingeyrar in Northern Iceland (founded in 1133) with the two ambitious writers Oddr Snorrason and Gunnlaugr Leifsson had a large share in this development.

The oldest typical example of the new style is probably the longer saga of St. John the Baptist, written by Grímr Hólmsteinsson († 1298) who was for some time parish priest in Odda, since the eleventh century an important centre of learning. Finnur Jónsson writes bluntly of Grímr's saga, that it is difficult to find a more unreadable book, and it must be admitted that to a modern mind the saga is not immediately attractive.<sup>9</sup> Excellent specimens of the adorned style which was a dominant feature of Old Norse hagiography in the fourteenth century can be found in *Holm 5 fol.*, *AM 232 fol.*, *Holm 16, 4<sup>o</sup>* and other manuscripts from this century. To my mind, abbot Arngrímr's saga of the Icelandic saint Guðmundr the Good (bishop of Hólar, † 1237) is the most admirable of this category. It is an Icelandic translation of Arngrímr's Latin *vita*, which was obviously intended for foreign readers. Björn M. Olsen has suggested that Arngrímr himself was responsible for the translation.<sup>10</sup> Whoever the translator was, he probably embellished

<sup>9</sup> I apologize for introducing the so called "modern mind" here. It is a much-abused term which has done considerable harm to mediaeval studies, and to study of Old Norse literature generally.

<sup>10</sup> *Safrn til sögu Islands og íslenskra bókmenta* (Copenhagen, 1902) III, 297-301.

his style with numerous latinisms quite deliberately; for it is one of the typical features of the ornate versions of Saints' Lives in Old Norse, that they constantly employ and adapt the stylistic features of ecclesiastical writings.

The learned writers of the fourteenth century were of course not satisfied with a mere emendation of style, they also attempted to improve and expand their version by drawing on various sources, and therefore often had to rearrange the materials found in older versions. Among such compilations are the saga of SS. John and James, and Bergr Sokkason's recension of the *Nikolaus saga*. It is no wonder that the craft of compilation was highly esteemed by Norwegian and Icelandic writers of the fourteenth century; they were at least as impressed as we are by the great mediaeval compilers Peter Comestor, Vincent of Beauvais, Jacobus a Voragine and others. Indeed it is not improbable that writers like Bergr and Arngrímr had, in the course of their study, first tried their hand at private *florilegia* before compiling their ambitious sagas.<sup>11</sup>

The ornate style was not, fortunately enough, the only stylistic ideal in hagiographic literature of the fourteenth century, otherwise we should now have few surviving examples of sagas in the older and simpler style. Perhaps the widening cleavage between clergy and laity included divergent views on style, so that the heavy burden of learning in the embellished versions of Saints' Lives had little appeal to ordinary churchgoers, who might well have preferred the older, simpler, and shorter versions, at any rate if they had to listen to them; for it must be remembered that in those days, when manuscripts were rare and illiteracy high, more literature was heard than read.<sup>12</sup> Whatever the explanation is, the fact remains that we have at least one great collection, *Holm 2. fol.* from the fourteenth century, containing 26 Saints' Lives, all of them later editions of previously translated sagas written in the simple or relatively simple style. This Icelandic manuscript is particularly precious for the study of hagiographic literature in Old Norse.<sup>13</sup>

After the heyday of Old Norse hagiography in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, a decline of creative interest in this branch of literature followed in the fifteenth century. Many factors combine to

11 On the place of the *florilegium* in the private monastic study, see R. W. Southern, *The Making of the Middle Ages* (London, 1953) 191 ff. and E. Ph. Goldschmidt, *Medieval Texts and their first Appearance in Print* (London, 1943) 106 ff.

12 Cf. W. T. H. Jackson, *The Literature of the Middle Ages* (New York, 1960) 45-61.

13 See P. G. Foote's introduction to the facsimile edition; cf. above, note 8.

account for this decline. Important among these is the Black Death, which was brought to Iceland in the early years of the fifteenth century, seriously hampering literary activities. Again, spiritual and literary influence on Iceland from Norway ceased to be as important as before, partly because Norway (with Iceland) had become part of the kingdom of Denmark in 1387, and partly because the development of the Norwegian vernacular was making more difficult a completely unhampered exchange of literature between Norway and Iceland. A more positive factor seriously limiting further contributions to the religious prose literature during the fifteenth century (apart, that is, from at least one truly great compilation of Miracles of the Virgin), was the Icelanders' ardent interest in poetry, first and foremost *rímur* but also religious poetry. Fortunately there remained diligent scribes who copied older sagas of holy men and women, and since the age did not favour the distinction between authors and scribes quite so much as we do, Icelandic scholars of the fifteenth century did not, I believe, share the depreciatory view of their efforts found in the handbooks of Old Norse literature. Indeed, the same scholars would perhaps be sceptical about our narrow and circumscribed attitude towards the late stage of Old Norse (Icelandic) hagiography which permits us to allow the great collection of Saints' Lives in *Holm 3 fol.* to remain unpublished. It is to be hoped that a competent editor with a sound understanding of hagiographic literature, a second C. R. Unger, will some day bring out an edition of it.

*Holm 3 fol.* dates from the first half of the sixteenth century (ca. 1525), and since there is no other equally large collection of Saints' Lives from the same period, this manuscript is our main source of information on Icelandic hagiography during the years immediately preceding the Lutheran Reformation which put an end to active interest in this sort of literature. The manuscript is too extensive to be described in detail here,<sup>14</sup> but references to its 25 legends will be found in our handlist. The most characteristic feature of the last stage in Icelandic hagiographic literature (as represented by *Holm 3 fol.*) is that the sagas of the saints have all been translated, simply or with expansions from Low German sources. This Low German influence on Icelandic literature even before the Reformation has been overlooked by a great many literary historians. The notion, encouraged by the first generations of ardent Lutherans, has been that Icelandic Letters were in a lethargic state

<sup>14</sup> See Ole Widding and Hans Bekker-Nielsen, 'En senmiddelalderlig legendesamling,' *Maal og Minne* (Oslo, 1960) 105-128, and a coming article in *Germanic Review* XXXVII.

before the Reformation and were only revived through the influence of the writings in Low German which accompanied it.

The *Holm 3 fol.* collection of Lives makes it clear that Low German influence on Icelandic literature was comparatively old, and definitely pre-Reformation. Low German influence is to be attributed primarily to the invention of printing which made accessible to book-lovers in Iceland a great number of books in a language that was not too difficult to understand. It shows also that there was at least one man in Iceland on the eve of the Lutheran Reformation, who was so interested in hagiographic literature that he compiled this magnificent collection of Saints' Lives, and he was probably not the only one. It has been suggested that the compiler and translator of *Holm 3 fol.* was Oddr Gottskálksson,<sup>15</sup> who became a loyal follower of the reformers, and who in the 1530's translated The New Testament into Icelandic (edited in Roskilde 1540). Whether Oddr was the translator or not, the mere existence of a manuscript containing 25 Saints' Lives in Icelandic, only a few years older than the Lutheran Reformation (officially introduced in Iceland 1550), indicates that the interest in hagiographic literature was still very much alive in the last years of the Old Norse period. Almost 400 years lies between the oldest fragment of Saints' Lives in Old Norse and the collection in *Holm 3 fol.*

It has sometimes been argued that hagiographic writings are only remotely connected with literature, properly so called, and there is a general sense in which this is true. However, in what concerns the somewhat limited field of Old Norse literature, hagiographic writings in the vernacular are of no little importance for investigating the origins and growth of native saga literature. I mentioned this earlier, but it cannot be emphasized too often, if we are ever to understand that Old Norse literature was part of a greater whole. The Saints' Lives in Old Norse must have been a constant challenge to writers of profane sagas. The present survey only presents a general impression of the history of hagiographic literature in Old Norse. I have not wanted to discuss any of the details which have yet to be investigated, for example, why certain very popular saints were never treated in a separate saga in Old Norse. Provided that the surviving manuscripts give a fair idea of the store of Saints' Lives in mediaeval Norway and Iceland, it is hard to explain why St. Patrick, St. Bernard of Clairvaux, St. Francis of Assisi, and other equally popular saints never became the heroes of separate sagas.

<sup>15</sup> *Maal og Minne* (Oslo, 1960) 127 f.

The handlist to be published in the next volume of *Mediaeval Studies* will contain details of all the extant Saints' Lives written in Old Norse. All hitherto edited texts will be indexed with full references to manuscripts and editions. Where more than one edition exists, only references to the best edition(s) will be given. Besides the manuscripts which have already been edited or used by the editors for variant readings, references will be given to all manuscripts on vellum containing hagiographic materials, as well as a selected number of manuscripts on paper, when these are careful copies of older manuscripts on vellum made by or for Árni Magnússon (or equally trustworthy scholars). Paper manuscripts of this category are for example *AM 628, 4°*, *AM 631, 4°*, and *636, 4°* all copies of the famous *Codex Scardensis*, such copies are listed immediately below their originals, in so far as these still exist. It is expressly stated when a manuscript is written on paper, all other manuscripts are on vellum. Where no reference to an edition is given, the manuscript (or the relevant part of the manuscript) has not yet been edited. The manuscripts belonging to the same version of a Saint's Life are of course grouped together, and the probable date of the manuscripts is indicated. In this the list reflects the present state of scholarship in the field. The different versions are classified in chronological order, but little importance is to be attached to this classification, as the generally accepted views of scholars on the probable date of a number of Saints' Lives are still somewhat uncertain.

The list will be arranged alphabetically, and the names of Saints given in their most common English form.<sup>16</sup> To facilitate identification the place of the saints in the calendar is indicated. The names of the sagas are cited according to their printed editions, and where they are unedited, to their official catalogues. Strict adherence to this practice has compelled us to include some rather clumsy or even misleading names (see e.g. St. Anne or St. Gregory on the Stone).

For all Saints' Lives translated from or based on Latin originals references are given to *Biblioteca Hagiographica Latina* (BHL). We have attempted to distinguish between close translations, where a simple reference is given to the Latin source in question (e.g. BHL 1075), and free (sometimes paraphrased) translations, in which case the reference to the Latin original is preceded by *cf.* (e.g. Cf. BHL 430) and now and again supplemented by a short note. Short notes on textual problems are provided when the editors of the handlist have considered them useful. We have silently corrected a number of minor errors in Unger's

<sup>16</sup> Usually in accordance with *The Book of Saints*, 4th ed. (London, 1947).

introductions, and in other surveys of Old Norse hagiography. A special word of warning must be issued on Paul Lehmann's frequently inaccurate statements in his otherwise illuminating and useful guide *Shandinaviens Anteil an der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters*,<sup>17</sup> which must and can only be used with the utmost care.

It has sometimes been hard to decide whether an Old Norse text should be admitted to the list or not, and we have therefore included a few texts which more rigid standards might exclude from hagiology. In doubt, we have relied on the practice of the Bollandists and the BHL, admitting fictitious saints like Gregory on the Stone to our list. Apocryphal writings such as the Gospel of Nicodemus and the *Transitus Mariae* have also been admitted. So too have the sagas of local saints. With slight modifications we have followed H. Magerøy in his attempt to distinguish between hagiographic and profane sagas<sup>18</sup> of local saints; however, since it was perfectly possible to write a saga of St. Olav which had neither the form nor edifying character of a Saint's Life, we experienced real doubt in deciding which sagas of St. Olav to include in the handlist. We hope our choice will find favour with most scholars.

The great collections of miracles of the Blessed Virgin in Old Norse have yet to be studied in greater detail before the questions of date and provenance can be answered. Some recent contributions show a growing understanding of the development of this vast literature, but we cannot yet give conclusive references to the sources of separate miracles, and we have accordingly only listed the manuscript collections, without specifying the miracles.

Bibliographical notes provide references to commentaries and studies of Old Norse Saints' Lives. The notes also include references to the standard histories of Old Norse literature, whenever these have a significant note on the saga in question. Existing bibliographies and surveys have been examined in the hope that no learned study will have escaped our notice. We ask forbearance and remind the reader that our bibliographical notes are selective rather than exhaustive.

Everywhere in the handlist we have made an effort to record the generally accepted views of scholars. We have been fortunate in this to have available the collections of references gathered in years of work on the preparation of *The Arnamagnean Dictionary of Old Norse*. Dr. Widting and I have, in the course of preparation of the handlist, freshly

<sup>17</sup> *Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Abteilung*, 1936 and 1937.

<sup>18</sup> 'Helgensoger,' *Kulturhistorisk Leksikon for nordisk middelalder* (Copenhagen, 1961), VI, s.v.

examined all references, and all three editors will revise the list thoroughly before sending it to press. Despite every precaution, we suppose that omissions and misstatements will be discovered in the list, and we shall be much obliged for communications regarding errors or omissions.

*Arnamagnæanske Kommissions Ordbog, Copenhagen*

# The Date of the "Apocalypse of Paul"

THEODORE SILVERSTEIN

## I

EVER since the Greek version of the *Apocalypse of Paul* was discovered by Constantine Tischendorf and published in 1866 its evidence has formed the foundation for the dating of that apocryphal work, whose influence was so great throughout the Middle Ages.<sup>1</sup> Previous conjecture, unhampered by access to the book itself, had depended on supposed contemporary citations of it in the Fathers and historians of the Church. The newly recovered text, however, contained a dated preface which henceforth disciplined guess and channeled citation. It also raised some notable difficulties. Thus one of the citations, subsequently adduced, goes back to the mid third century<sup>2</sup> and the preface contradicts anything so early. The state of its text was such, moreover, as to foster some further ambiguity of its own, which Tischendorf sought to clarify quite simply. The apocalypse, he contended from the testimony of the preface, was written during the late fourth century, perhaps in the year when Theodosius the Elder died, and pre-dated by the author to A.D. 380. But in

<sup>1</sup> *Apocalypses apocryphae* (Leipzig, 1866), XIV-XVIII (*prolegomena*) and 34-60 (text). Tischendorf had discovered a copy of the book in 1843, then both announced the discovery and given his argument for its date in 1851: *Theologische Studien und Kritiken*, XXIV, 439-42. But two years before the edition the Rev. Justin Perkins had found and printed in English translation a Syriac version: 'The Revelation of the Blessed Apostle Paul,' *Journal of Sacred Literature and Biblical Record*, n.s., VI (1865), 372-401; and *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, VIII (1864-66), 183-212. Tischendorf uses this version in his footnotes. For the mediaeval history of the work see especially Hermann Brandes, 'Ueber die Quellen der mittelenglischen Versionen der Paulus-Vision,' *Englische Studien*, VII (1884), 34-65, and *Visio S. Pauli: Ein Beitrag zur Visionslitteratur* (Gesellschaft für Deutsche Philologie, Festschrift, V [Halle, 1885]); E. Wieber, *De Apocalypsis S. Pauli codicibus* (Diss. Marburg, 1904); Silverstein, *Visio Sancti Pauli* (Studies and Documents, No. IV [London, 1935]).

<sup>2</sup> Origen as quoted by Gregory Barhebraeus, *Nonn canon*, vii, 9, ed. Bedjan (Paris-Leipzig, 1898), 104-105; translated by Giuseppe Ricciotti, *L'Apocalisse di Paolo siriana* (Brescia, 1932), I, 25, and R. P. Casey, 'The Apocalypse of Paul,' *JTS*, XXXIV (1933), 26-27. See below, n. 5. For a further list of the citations see, e.g., Tischendorf's summary in *Theologische Stud. u. Krit.*, loc. cit., and in *Apocalypses apocryphae*, XIV-XVI; Ricciotti, *L'Apocalisse di Paolo siriana*, I, 13-15; and Casey, pp. 26-31.



order to establish this view he had to emend his text, then argue, though with doubt, from the emendation.<sup>3</sup>

With what success he argued we may judge from the fact that his conclusions have been generally accepted to this day. Does other evidence in the body of the text suggest an earlier, or later, epoch,<sup>4</sup> no matter; it is the preface that must be determinative. Is Origen said to mention the Apocalypse of Paul in the middle of the third century and in Egypt, then the citation must be corrupt; doubtless it was the Apocalypse of Peter he really had in mind.<sup>5</sup> Thus one emendation begets a "fact," and another elsewhere removes an obstacle to its acceptance. The recovery in more recent times of the early Long Latin version of the book, with a preface very like the Greek which seems to indicate the year 388, has brought only minor variation in the dating.<sup>6</sup> And a current summary of the textual traditions continues to list the supposed original under the heading *Apocalypsis Pauli c. 380 Hierosolymis graece composita*.<sup>7</sup> This is simply Tischendorf simplified by omission of that scholar's reservation. Even Casey's ingenious solution of the contradiction between early citation and later prefatory witness — namely, that there must in fact have been two editions, as it were, of the work, one in the third and another in the fourth century — does not depart entirely from the established view.<sup>8</sup>

The present article will make such a departure. It will do so by reexamining the evidence Tischendorf had before him, to which it will add the Long Latin text. It will assert that the Greek, Long Latin, and Syriac versions represent an original issued, not in the fourth, but in the fifth century. That original, it will argue, was set down before the year 450, perhaps soon after A.D. 431, and then pre-dated by its author to the year 420. Moreover, if this is the case, it will contend, there is now some slight additional support for Casey's hypothesis of the existence of an

<sup>3</sup> *Theologische Stud. u. Krit.*, XXIV, 441-42, and *Apocalypses apocryphae*, XVI. See below n. 14.

<sup>4</sup> See below, next note, and n. 30 and its context.

<sup>5</sup> Thus Theodor Zahn, 'Ueber einige armenische Verzeichnisse kanonischer und apokrypher Bücher,' *Paralipomena* (Forschungen zur Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Bücher, V. I [Erlangen und Leipzig, 1893]), 111, n. 4. But for the objections to such a view, together with further evidence that Origen knew Paul, see Casey, p. 27. Ricciotti, *L'Apocalisse di Paolo siriana*, I, 25-26, is puzzled by the quotation.

<sup>6</sup> M. R. James, *Apocrypha anecdota I* (Texts and Studies, II.3 [Cambridge, 1893]), 1-42, but especially 11. See below, nn. 40 and 41 and their context.

<sup>7</sup> Fr. Stegmüller, *Repertorium biblicum medii aevi*, I (Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, Instituto Francisco Suárez [Madrid, 1940 (1950)]), 240. Cf. *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du moyen âge*, XXVI (1960), 200, n. 5.

<sup>8</sup> Casey, pp. 8 and 26 ff., but especially 28 and 31-32. Cf. Silverstein, *Visio sancti Pauli*, 3 and 91-92, n. 2.

earlier edition of the book, an edition which would explain, but not explain away, Origen's supposed citation in the third century.

## II

Tischendorf's evidence for dating consisted chiefly in three items, the Greek text itself and two early references, one in St Augustine's tractate on the Gospel of St John (xcviii. 8) and the other in Sozomen's *Ecclesiastical History* (VII.xix.10-11). Let us examine each in order.

The preface to the Greek text begins thus its account of the book's discovery under the apostle's house in Tarsus:

Οικοῦντός τινος ἀξιωματοῦς ἐν Ταρσῷ τῇ πόλει εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν τοῦ ἁγίου Παύλου τοῦ ἀποστόλου ἐπὶ τῆς ὑπατείας Θεοδοσίου τοῦ εὐσεβοῦς βασιλέως καὶ Κωντιανοῦ τοῦ λαμπροτάτου, ἀπεκαλύφθη αὐτῷ ἄγγελος κυρίου λέγων· τὸν θεμέλιον τῆς οἰκίας ταύτης καταλύσας ὅπερ εὐρήσεις ἔπαρον... ἐπιμείναντος δὲ τοῦ ἀγγέλου ἕως τρίτης ὁράσεως ἠναγκάσθη ὁ ἀξιωματικὸς καταλῦσαι τὸν θεμέλιον, καὶ σκάψας εὗρεν γλωσσόκομον μαρμάρινον ἔχοντα τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν ταύτην, καὶ λαβὼν αὐτὴν ὑπέδειξεν τῷ ἄρχοντι τῆς πόλεως. ὁ δὲ ἄρχων ἰδὼν αὐτὸ κατησφαλισμένον μολύβδῳ ἀπέστειλεν τῷ βασιλεῖ Θεοδοσίῳ, εὐλαβοῦμένος τι ἕτερον εἶναι· ὅπερ δεξάμενος ὁ βασιλεὺς καὶ μεταγράψας ἔπεμψεν ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις τὸ ἀθηντίμιον γράμμα.<sup>9</sup>

Unfortunately for the problem in hand, the second consul's name, *Κωντιανοῦ*, is evidently corrupt. The *Chronicon paschale* records *Κωντιανός* (though not *Κωντιάνος*) for the Latin Quintianus, and there were two earlier consuls by that name, though none who served as colleague with either Emperor Theodosius.<sup>10</sup> On the other hand, a *Κανδιδιάνος* is known as *comes domesticorum* under Theodosius the Younger but never as consul, whether with or without an imperial colleague.<sup>11</sup> Tischendorf does not entertain such considerations but removes the difficulty by emending *Κωντιανοῦ* to *Γρατιανοῦ*. This gives him a readable line and places the discovery during the period when Gratian and Theodosius the Elder were imperial colleagues in the consulship, that is, as we have seen, in A.D. 380.<sup>12</sup> In support he now adds the testimony of St Augustine and

<sup>9</sup> *Apocalypses apocryphae*, 34-35 and n. 1.

<sup>10</sup> Ed. Theodor Mommsen, in *Chronica minora* (Monumenta Germaniae historica: Auctorum antiquiss. tom. IX.1 [Berlin, 1892]), I, 227 and 230, for the years A.D. 235 and 289. Cf. Attilio Degraffi, *I fasti consolari dell'impero romano* (Sussidi eruditi, no. 3 [Rome, 1952]), 65 and 76.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. J. D. Mansi, *Sacrorum conciliorum... collectio*, IV (Florence, 1760), 1231-34.

<sup>12</sup> Degraffi, *Fasti consolari*, p. 84; *Chronica minora*, ed. Mommsen, I, 243.

Sozomen; the former of value since, written in 416 or thereabouts, it implies the existence of the book before that time, and the latter important because it repeats in detail the discovery story and sets its supposed occurrence, as Tischendorf and others have read the passage, exactly as they want it in Theodosius' reign.<sup>13</sup>

But the emendation raises an immediate question which Tischendorf himself perceived but left unanswered.<sup>14</sup> How does it happen, if he be correct, that Gratian is mentioned second to Theodosius, who was his junior in both the principate and the number of his consulship? Contemporary references, whether legal or less formal, regularly place Gratian first, and when all the imperial names are listed together Theodosius normally stands third after Valentinian.<sup>15</sup> And if it be answered that, nevertheless, informality permits some latitude, that the events depicted particularly involve Theodosius, and that an Eastern author might have had the motive to place him first, then let us counter with an observation on the Greek preface which should dismiss Gratian forever from its text. This is that its statement of the consulship clearly employs Byzantine titles of honor, the second of which is simply inappropriate to an emperor: ἐπὶ τῆς ὑπατείας Θεοδοσίου τοῦ εὐσεβοῦς βασιλέως καὶ Κωντιανοῦ τοῦ λαμπροτάτου. Εὐσεβῆς βασιλεύς, i.e. *pius rex*, *pius imperator*,<sup>16</sup> will do for Theodosius, but ὁ λαμπρότατος stands for the Latin *v.c.*, i.e. *vir clarissimus*,

<sup>13</sup> See, among others, *Theologische Stud. u. Krit.*, XXIV, 440; *Apocalypses apocryphae*, XIV-XV; M. R. James, *The Apocryphal New Testament* (Oxford, 1924), 525; Ricciotti, *L'Apocalisse di Paolo siriana*, I, 13-15; and below, nn. 40 and 41 and their context.

<sup>14</sup> *Theologische Stud. u. Krit.*, XXIV, 442: "ich möchte Gratianou für Κωντιανου lesen, wornach, wenn die Umstellung "Theodosius und Gratian" statt "Gratian und Theodosius" unbedenklich ist, das Jahr 380 bezeichnet würde..."

<sup>15</sup> E.g.:

DAT. XV KAL. IVL. THESSAL(ONICA) GRAT(IANO) A. V ET THEOD(OSIO) A. I CONSS.

Γρατιανός τὸ ε καὶ Θεοδόσιος τὸ α.

ἐν ᾧ Γρατιανός τὸ πέμπτον καὶ Θεοδόσιος τὸ πρῶτον ὑπάτευσον.

IMPP. GRATIANVS, VALENTINIANVS ET THEODOSIVS AAA. AD BASSVM P(RAEFECTVM) V(RBI).

οἱ δεσπότες ἡμῶν Γατιανός καὶ Οὐαλεντινιανός καὶ Θεοδόσιος οἱ αἰώνιοι Αὔγουστοι.

For the Latin formulas see *Theodosiani libri XVI*, ed. Theodor Mommsen, 1.2 (Berlin, 1905), 137 (June 17, 380), and 40 (November [?] 22, 382); cf. pp. 33, 45, 53, 137, 201, 202, 261, 288, 306, 338, 380, etc. For the Greek see Fr. Preisigke, *Wörterbuch der griechischen Papyrusurkunden mit Einschluss der griechischen Inschriften*, etc., III.1 (Berlin, 1929), 76 and 69; and for the second Greek line above, Sozomen, *Kirchengeschichte*, VII.v.7, ed. Joseph Bidez and G. C. Hansen (Berlin, 1960), 307.

<sup>16</sup> See, e.g., Preisigke, III.1, Abschnitt 2, especially 51 ff., where εὐσεβῆς, εὐσεβέστατος, and *pissimus* all occur. In connection with the argument that follows, I wish to acknowledge the friendly interest and learned criticism of my colleagues, Professors Einarson and Oost.

a title lower in the honorific scale and normal for a consul who neither was Augustus or Caesar nor belonged to the princely house. Examples are commonplace in the fourth century and after, like these chiefly from Gratian's own time :

[Two non-imperial consuls]

FLAVIO LEONTIO PRAEFECTO PRAETORIO ET FLAVIO SALLUSTIO MAGISTRO PEDITVM VV CC COSS.; Φλασούιος Λεόντιος καὶ Φλασούιος Σαλούστιος οἱ λαμπρότατοι ἑπαρχοι.—

Φλαύιοι Ἀντώνιος ὁ λαμπρότατος καὶ Σνάγκριος ὁ λαμπρότατος ἑπαρχος.

[An imperial and a non-imperial consul]

[DAT.] VII ID. SEPT. MOGONTIACI P.C. GRAT(IANI) A. III ET EQVITI VC. CONSS.; Γρατιανὸς ὁ αἰώνιος Αὔγουστος καὶ Φλαύιος Ἐκύσιος ὁ λαμπρότατος.<sup>17</sup>

Γρατιανοῦ, therefore, cannot be correct, nor the date 380, which depends on it.

At this point it will be convenient to introduce the evidence of a text unknown to Tischendorf, that is, the Long Latin, as edited by M. R. James.<sup>18</sup> This is the only other surviving version that attempts to place the discovery precisely; for while the Syriac reproduces the preface in a form analogous to that of the other two, it has dropped the troublesome second consul entirely.<sup>19</sup> The Long Latin, once it has given the title and quoted the verses of II Corinthians 12. 1-5, on which the authority of the apocalypse is based, proceeds abruptly to its version of the Tarsus story: "Quo tempore palam facta est? Consule Theodosio Augusto minore et Quinegio [*sic ms.*; *James emend.* Cynegio], tunc habitante quodam honorato Tharso..<sup>20</sup> Theodosius and Cynegius (Κυνήγιος) were consuls together, as the *Fasti consulares* record, the one for the East, the other for the West, in 388.<sup>21</sup> Whatever support St. Augustine and

<sup>17</sup> The actual quotations are from Preisigke, III.1, 75 f. (for the years 344 and 382); and *Theodosiani libri*, ed. Mommsen, I.2, 193 (for September 7, 375 [374]); but both works contain many further instances, *passim*.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. above, n. 6. Translation by James, *Apocryphal N. T.*, 525-55.

<sup>19</sup> Cf. Silverstein, *Visio sancti Pauli*, 103, n. 7; and Casey, p. 6. To the evidence of this Syriac version (S<sup>1</sup>) Casey adds that of an inedited Jacobite version (S<sup>2</sup>) in a Harvard MS, *Sem. Mus.* 3985, which likewise drops the second name. It should be noted that both Syriac versions have shifted the passage from preface to epilogue.

<sup>20</sup> James, *Apocrypha anecdota* I, 11. Quinegius for Cynegius would be one normal form of Latin transliteration of the Greek Κυνήγιος. Cf. Κυντιάνος = Quintianus, above, n. 10 and its context.

<sup>21</sup> Degrassi, *Fasti consolari*, 85; and *Chronica minora*, ed. Mommsen, I, 244.

Sozomen have been supposed to lend to Tischendorf would apply as well to this slightly modified date. If Gratian then seem impossible as a reading, does Cynegius solve the question of the second name?

But Cynegius was consul with Theodosius the Elder and the Latin text reads Theodosius *minor*, who not only began to reign twenty years after Cynegius' death,<sup>22</sup> but was never consular colleague during the forty-two years of his rule with any other figure called Cynegius. What we gain therefore with the seeming clarification of the second name we lose with the further definition of the first. The Long Latin text, in short, is as problematical as the Greek. It enables us, however, to return to the Greek with a new insight, that the Theodosius intended is indeed the Younger, the time referred to not the fourth but the fifth century and the corruption solvable by being read in this fresh circumstance.

The second name, it is here suggested, should be Constantius; the date intended is the year 420, when Theodosius *minor* was consul for the East and Flavius Constantius consul for the West.<sup>23</sup> The line in the Greek text of *Paul* would then read: ἐπὶ τῆς ὑπατείας Θεοδοσίου τοῦ εὐσεβοῦς βασιλέως καὶ Κωνσταντίου τοῦ λαμπροτάτου. It would parallel extant consular formulas for that year: μετὰ τὴν ὑπατίαν τῶν δεσπ. ἡμῶν Θεοδ. αἰωνίου Αὐγ. τὸ θ καὶ Φλ. Κωνστ. τὸ γ τοῦ λαμπροτάτου πατρικίου; DAT. VIII ID. MART. RAV(ENNAE) THEOD(OSIO) A. VIII ET CONSTANTIO III V.C. CONSS.<sup>24</sup>

Now this suggestion, which takes into account both the order of the names and the use of honorific titles, has besides three further advantages: it permits a simple explanation palaeographically of how the corruption was produced; it fits with a special characteristic of the Greek version; and it brings new light to the references in St Augustine and Sozomen, which now can be interpreted as not inconsistent with its evidence.

<sup>22</sup> Cynegius died during his consulship: cf. *Consularia Constantinopolitana*, in *Chronica minora*, ed. Mommsen, I, 244, s.a. 388. Theodosius the Younger was emperor from 408 to 450. That this emperor is here to be understood is beyond question. The normal terms in Latin tradition for the elder Theodosius are *maior* and *senior*, for the younger *minor* and *iunior*: see, e.g., Orosius, *Historia adversus paganos*, VII.xxxvii; Bede, *Historia ecclesiastica*, I.xiii, ed. Plummer (Oxford, 1896; repr. 1956), I, 28, and n. to I.xi, II, 22, s.v. *minoris*; and Isidoré of Seville, *Etymologiae*, ed. Lindsay (Oxford, 1911), V.i.7: *Theodosius minor Augustus*. Ammianus Marcellinus, *Rerum gestarum libri*, XXIX.vi.15, ed. C. U. Clark, II (Berlin, 1915), 522, to be sure, once calls the elder Theodosius *iunior* but in a particular context, before the young duke's promotion to the principate, in order to distinguish him from his active father, Flavius Theodosius. The Greek historian Zosimus, *Historia nova*, refers to the elder Theodosius as ὁ πρεσβύτερος (V.xxxviii.1, ed. Mendelssohn [Leipzig, 1887], 266), to the younger as ὁ νέος (V. xxxii.1, ed. Mendelssohn, 257). Cf. Du Cange, *Gloss. ad scriptores med. et inf. graecitatis* (Lyons, 1688), s.v. ΝΕΟΣ (=iunior).

<sup>23</sup> Degrassi, *Fasti consolari*, 88; and *Chronica minora*, ed. Mommsen, I, 246.

<sup>24</sup> Preisigke, III.1, 77; and *Theodosiani libri*, ed. Mommsen, I.2, 579.

As to the first, names are frequently enough confused in manuscript transmission; considering that the Latin was copied in the eighth century and the two codices of Tischendorf's text in the thirteenth and the sixteenth,<sup>25</sup> sufficient opportunity would seem to have existed for such confusion. We need not, however, resort to any possibility so general. *Κωνσταντιος* was singularly suited to produce (as *Γρατιανός* was not), from an abbreviation by suspension *Κων* read as *Κων*,<sup>26</sup> the clever but erroneous expansion of the Latin, Quinegius, the name of a well-known administrator in the Roman West of his day. On the other hand, in a form written with normal tachygraphic symbols *Κωνσταντιου* might have appeared thus: *Κωνσταντιου*.<sup>27</sup> A slight carelessness with the sigma-loop on the tau and a small displacement to the right of the superscribed hook for *αν*, could easily then have misled a later scribe, in expanding, to set down the puzzling *Κωντιανοῦ*.

The Greek, moreover, provides other backing for the name in a peculiar detail elsewhere in its text. The various versions of *Paul*, as Casey once observed, are singularly free of reference to the great doctrinal controversies of the fourth century,<sup>28</sup> the most notable heretics in the apocalypse being simply these: "whosoever confesseth not that Christ is come in the flesh and that the Virgin Mary bare him, and whosoever saith of the bread and the cup of blessing of the Eucharist that it is not the body and the blood of Christ," and "those which say that Christ rose not from the dead, and that this fles riseth not again."<sup>29</sup> The Greek version, however, describes the first of these groups of sinners as *ἄσσοι οὐκ ὁ-*

<sup>25</sup> James, *Apocrypha anecdota* I, 2; and Tischendorf, *Apocalypses apocryphae*, XVI-XVII. Tischendorf dates the Milan codex, *Ambrosius C* 255, as not earlier than the fifteenth century, but present estimates place it in the sixteenth: cf. Martini and Bassi, *Catalogus cod. graec. Bibliothecae Ambrosianae* (Milan, 1906), II, 896, s.n. 895.

<sup>26</sup> Abbreviation of Constantinus and Constantius was frequently *Κωνσ* or *Κωσ* but the form *Κω* = *Κων* also occurs: see V. Gardthausen, *Die Schrift, Unterschriften und Chronologie im Alterthum und im Byzantinischen Mittelalter* (Griechische Palaeographie, vol II, 2nd ed. [Leipzig, 1913]), 348.

<sup>27</sup> See Gardthausen, p. 335 and Table 12 for *αν*, p. 340 and Table 12 for *ι* = *τι*, and Tables 4a-11 for *στ* combinations; and G. Tsereteli, *Sokrashcheniia v Grecheskikh rukopisjakh* (St. Petersburg, 1904), Table 1 (*αν*) and table 10 (*ι* = *τι*). Tsereteli's example of *τι*, dated A.D. 1060 is terminal, but see similar instances (Table 10) for *το*, *του*, *τους*, etc., which are internal.

<sup>28</sup> Casey, e.g., pp. 28, 29, 31.

<sup>29</sup> James, *Apocryphal N. T.*, 546 and 547; cf. *Apocrypha anecdota* I, 34, 11.14-17 and 23-24. For the other versions see Tischendorf, *Apocalypses apocryphae*, 61, n. 41 (the Syriac; see below, n. 43 and its context); E. A. W. Budge, *Miscellaneous Coptic Texts in the Dialect of Upper Egypt* (London, 1915), 546-47 (text), 1066-67 (translation), and clxix (summary); Casey, p. 18; and Silverstein, *Visio sancti Pauli*, 107, nn. 58 and 59, and 91 f., n. 2.

μολόγησαν θεοτόκον τὴν ἁγίαν Μαρίαν, καὶ ὅτι οὐκ ἐνηνθρόωπησεν ἐξ αὐτῆς ὁ κύριος.<sup>30</sup> The term *θεοτόκος* is patent reference to the Nestorian heresy, loudly urged and loudly condemned in the year 431.<sup>31</sup> If this is integral to the version itself and not the tampering of an interested scribe or editor,<sup>32</sup> the convergence which it produces both argues for the reading of the consul's name as Constantius and defines further the fifth-century date.

This leads attention next to St Augustine and Sozomen, whose words have been repeated from the days of Lücke to those of M. R. James and beyond as proof of the traditional fourth-century dating.<sup>33</sup> Of the two, Sozomen's passage has the greater intrinsic interest, since it is circumstantial and composed in part of a summary of the Tarsus preface. The historian has been describing the various customs of the churches in his day, among them some in Palestine, where the Apocalypse of Peter is still read. He then continues:

τὴν δὲ νῦν ὡς Ἀποκάλυψιν Παύλου τοῦ ἀποστόλου φερομένην, ἣν οὐδεὶς ἀρχαίων οἶδε, πλεῖστοι μοναχῶν ἐπαινοῦσιν. ἐπὶ ταύτης δὲ τῆς βασιλείας ἰσχυρίζονται τινες ταύτην ἠόρησθαι τὴν βίβλον. λέγουσι γὰρ ἐκ θείας ἐπιφανείας ἐν Ταρσῷ τῆς Κιλικίας κατὰ τὴν οἰκίαν Παύλου μαρμαρίναν λάονακα ὑπὸ γῆν εὐρεθῆναι καὶ ἐν αὐτῇ τὴν βίβλον εἶναι. ἐρομένῳ δέ μοι περὶ τούτου ψεῦδος ἔφησεν εἶναι Κίλιξ πρεσβύτερος τῆς ἐν Ταρσῷ ἐκκλησίας· γεγονέναι μὲν γὰρ πολλῶν ἐτῶν καὶ ἡ πολιὰ τὸν ἄνδρα ἐδείκνυ· ἔλεγε δὲ μηδὲν τοιοῦτον ἐπίστασθαι παρ' αὐτοῖς συμβάν, θαυμάζειν τε εἰ μὴ τάδε πρὸς αἰρετικῶν ἀναπέπλασται.<sup>34</sup>

Without doubt Sozomen is here speaking of our book and speaking with direct and first-hand knowledge of its existence. If monks were com-

<sup>30</sup> *Apocalypses apocryphae*, 62.

<sup>31</sup> Cf. the account of the Third Council of Ephesus, in Mansi, *Sacrorum conciliorum... collectio*, IV, 567 ff.

<sup>32</sup> See below, nn. 40, 42-44 and their context.

<sup>33</sup> See above, n. 13.

<sup>34</sup> Ed. Bidez and Hansen, pp. 331-32. We observe that in the anonymous English version of Sozomen, London, 1846, 355, the phrase *ἣν οὐδεὶς ἀρχαίων οἶδε* is rendered "though rejected by the ancients," which might be seen as implying for the original form of the book an early date compatible with Origen's third-century reference or something older; see above, n. 2. But the words themselves quite simply mean "which none of the old-time (Christians) knew" (cf. James, *Apocryphal N.T.*, 525: "which none of the ancients ever saw"), thus providing no more than an incredulous historian's allusion to the book's relatively late and pseudepigraphical character. For the special meaning of *ἀρχαῖος* in this context see E. A. Sophocles, *Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods* (New York, 1893), *ιερβ. cit.*

mending the apocalypse in his time, that means about or shortly after the year 443.<sup>35</sup> But what date does he intend for the story of the discovery? The answer to this turns on the phrase ἐπὶ ταύτης δὲ τῆς βασιλείας. M. R. James paraphrases the words "in the reign we write of," and, following Tischendorf in effect, takes the time to be that of Theodosius the Elder.<sup>36</sup> Throughout the book, it should be observed, similar stock expressions (ἐπὶ ταύτης δὲ τῆς ἡγεμονίας, περὶ [or κατὰ or ὑπὸ] δὲ τοῦτον τὸν χρόνον, etc.) do occur in contexts where reference is to the later fourth century. In favor of such an interpretation in the present instance is the fact that Sozomen has in the preceding chapters been writing about the elder Theodosius' time and will take up further events of the same period in the chapters which immediately follow. Additionally, there is the implication (not exploited by either James or Tischendorf) of the presbyter's considerable age (ἐρομένῳ δὲ μοι περὶ τοῦτου ψεῦδος ἔφησεν εἶναι Κίλιξ πεσβύτερος τῆς ἐν Ταρσῷ ἐκκλησίας · γεγονέναι μὲν γὰρ πολλῶν ἐτῶν καὶ ἡ πολιὰ τὸν ἄνδρα ἐδείκνυ), which can be seen as suggesting a rather distant past.

Yet these considerations, though cogent, are not demonstrative. The crucial phrase ἐπὶ ταύτης δὲ τῆς βασιλείας is ambiguous unless made precise by its context. And the one characteristic which distinguishes Chapter 19 of Book VII is that, unlike all the other chapters in the book, it deliberately breaks the pattern of chronology. In Chapters 17 and 18 Sozomen has been summarizing a number of heresies which arose and were condemned in the epoch of the elder Theodosius, especially the Novatian heresy concerning Easter and the resulting further quarrel with Sabbatius. This takes him to an account of the various ways of reckoning the date of Easter current just before the mid fifth century. Chapter 19 now supervenes, broadening into something very general, until it provides in essence, along with some history that goes back to the second century, a separate dissertation on a miscellany of differing rituals, customs, organizations, even special readings prevalent among the churches and communities of Sozomen's own day. It is in this setting that he tells us that *Peter* is still read and that *Paul* is still esteemed by most monks; though the truth of the latter's Tarsus preface is denied by an elderly presbyter from that city, whose grey hair would be a mark of reliability, not necessarily of a long fourth-century memory. The time of which Sozomen is at the moment writing is the present, this reign, the reign of

<sup>35</sup> The likely *terminus post quem* for Sozomen's *History*, the *terminus ante quem* being 450, the year when Theodosius the Younger, to whom the book is dedicated, died. Cf. ed. Bidez and Hansen, pp. LXIV-LXVII: "Die Abfassung der Kirchengeschichte."

<sup>36</sup> *Apocryphal N. T.*, 525.



Theodosius *minor*. It is of this reign, ἐπὶ ταύτης δὲ τῆς βασιλείας, that he relates the tale of the discovery in Tarsus. And the apologetic words with which the chapter ends, disclosing that he knows what he has been doing, confirm that separate, digressive character on which the present argument is founded:

ἀλλὰ περὶ μὲν τούτου τάδε. πολλὰ δ' ἂν εὖροι τις ἔθνη κατὰ πόλεις καὶ κώμας, ἅπερ αἰδοῖ τῶν ἐξ ἀρχῆς παραδεδωκότων ἢ τῶν τούτους διαδεξαμένων οὐχ ὅσιον οὐδὲ ἀνεκτὸν ἡγοῦνται παραβαίνειν οἱ τοῦτοις ἐντραφέντες. ταῦτόν δὲ τοῦτο πεπονθῆναι νομιστέον τοὺς ἀνθρώπους καὶ περὶ ταύτην τὴν ἑορτὴν, ἣς ἔνεκεν εἰς τοὺς περὶ τούτων ἐξηγέσθην λόγους.<sup>37</sup>

If Sozomen can thus be seen to support a date in the third or fourth decade of the fifth century, a new question naturally follows: How can such a dating be consistent with the mention of *Paul* in a homily written by St Augustine about the year 416? The answer is not difficult to find. Critics have long assumed that his reference is to the same form of the text as that to which the *Ecclesiastical History* alludes.<sup>38</sup> It need not, however, be so. St Augustine gives no more of the contents of the apocalypse than the reference in its heading to II Corinthians, and out of the forbidding words of the apostle condemns the vanity of men who have concocted a scripture based on those very words:

Quamquam et inter ipsos spirituales sunt utique aliis alii capaciores atque meliores; ita ut quidam illorum ad ea pervenerit quae non licet homini loqui. Qua occasione vani quidem Apocalypsim Pauli, quam sana non recipit Ecclesia, nescio quibus fabulis plenam, stultissima praesumptione finxerunt; dicentes hanc esse unde dixerat raptum se fuisse in tertium coelum, et illic audisse ineffabilia verba quae non licet homini loqui (II Cor. xii, 2, 4). Utcumque illorum tolerabilis esset audacia, si se audisse dixisset quae adhuc non licet homini loqui: cum vero dixerit, quae non licet homini loqui; isti qui sunt qui haec audeant impudenter et infelicer loqui?<sup>39</sup>

No further objection on substantive grounds beyond a general disapproval of the book,<sup>40</sup> appears in the passage nor any indication that the homilist knew the Tarsus preface. Is it not then simply the case that the text about which St Augustine is talking is, after all, not the version furnished with

<sup>37</sup> VII.xix.12, ed. Bidez and Hansen, p. 332.

<sup>38</sup> See Tischendorf, *Apocalypses apocryphae*, XIV, and in *Theologische Stud. u. Krit.*, XXIV, 39-40, with their references to Fabricius and Lücke; and James, *Apocryphal N. T.*, 525.

<sup>39</sup> Migne, PL XXXV, 1885A.

<sup>40</sup> On the conjectured reasons for this disapproval of so "innocent" a work as *Paul* see Casey, p. 29.

that preface and especially known in Palestine during the days of Theodosius *minor*, but an earlier edition without the preface which was circulating still in Africa and had furnished occasion long before for remarks also by Origen?

### III

This is the evidence of primary importance as it looks to the present writer, these are the conclusions that seem best to be drawn therefrom. One point, however, of some interest remains, which, touching the character of Tischendorf's Greek text in connection with the related Syriac and Long Latin, will affect our final opinion as to when the "Tarsus edition" was made. This is that the extant Greek may represent, not that second edition pure, but a tendentious fifth-century copy of it; and this is the position taken by Casey.<sup>41</sup> His judgment rests on two suppositions: that the Tarsus text originated in the late fourth century, hence well before the rise of Nestorianism; and that the absence of anti-Nestorian prejudice in all but the extant Greek confirms its absence also from the Tarsus source. The prejudice itself appears in the transformation of a passage on heresy in Hell, from unbelief in the Virgin Birth, into denial that Mary was the mother of God. The Long Latin text, on which Casey's implied argument from date chiefly rests, he seeks to place between 388 and 402, overlooking, as he does so, the obstacle to the first date in what has been seen to be the confusion of the Latin consular names, and to the second in the doubtfulness of the special evidence he admits. That evidence is an assumed use by the Latin poet Prudentius (*Cathemerinon*, V, 125 ff.) of *Paul's* account of the respite from torment in Hell.<sup>42</sup> But Prudentius, whose work was written by 402, never names or alludes directly to the apocalypse and may have derived the motif from another source. Nor, even granting dependence, is there anything which requires that the version which Prudentius knew be the Long Latin.<sup>43</sup> In brief, both

<sup>41</sup> Pp. 2, 6, and 28-29. The chief *Tendenz* is anti-Nestorianism; but D. Serruys ('Une source gnostique de l'Apocalypse de Paul,' *Revue de philologie, de littérature et d'histoire anciennes*, XXXV [1911], 194-202) and L. Šepelevič (*Etiody o Dantě : Apokrifičeskoye "Vidění Sv. Paula"* [Kharkov, 1891], I, 42 ff.) have tried to show, respectively, Gnostic and anti-Paulician influences on the Greek, neither in the view of the present writer quite successfully.

<sup>42</sup> Casey, pp. 28-29. Cf. Arturo Graf, *Miti, leggende e superstizioni del medio evo* (Torino, 1892), "Il riposo dei dannati," pp. 246, 264; and S. Merkle, 'Die Sabbatruhe in der Hölle,' *Römische Quartalschrift*, IX (1892), 489-505.

<sup>43</sup> He could have read the book in Greek if Bergman (ed. *Prudentii... carmina* [CSEL, LXI, 1926], 459) and Raby (*A History of Christian-Latin Poetry* [2nd ed., Oxford, 1953], 69)

termini are insecure; nothing thus far brought forward obliges us to place the Latin text this early, hence earlier still, *a fortiori*, the Greek form of the Tarsus edition which it translates. As for the anti-Nestorian coloring, that its absence from both the Latin and the Syriac (and their dependents) is in each case for the same reason, is pure conjecture. If we suppose that in fact the reference was an authentic part of the Tarsus edition, its disappearance early from the Syriac would not have been surprising, considering the area in which that version circulated and the evidence that it soon indeed fell into Nestorian hands. Expectation is fulfilled in the surviving texts of the Syriac, which must have had in their source the transformed passage; since, Nestorian in origin, they seem deliberately to have sought to save their sectarian readers embarrassment by removing, not simply the single offensive word, *θεοτόκος*, but the entire statement in which that word appeared:

"My Lord, who are these, that deserve this pit?" and he said unto me: "Those who do not confess Jesus Christ, nor his resurrection, nor his humanity; but consider him as all mortals [earthly ones]; and who say that the sacrament of the body of our Lord is bread."<sup>44</sup>

Anti-Nestorianism could not be made to vanish more patently than that. But such absence from the Long Latin, the associations of which are Western, is another matter. The Latin reading in the M. R. James edition might well be thought to substantiate Casey's claim: "Ii sunt quicumque non confessus fuerit Christum uenisse in carne et quia genuit eum Maria uirgo..."<sup>45</sup> Nevertheless, it is not certain how good a witness this particular text is, since another copy exists, different and sometimes superior to James's, that, like the Greek omitting reference to the Virgin Birth, instead makes the heresy turn on the belief that Mary brought forth Christ the true God. It furnishes us a line which, though not precisely marked with the term that Nestorius abjured, at least suggests the doctrine, as well as considerable question about the original Latin wording at this point: "'Quicumque non confessus fuerit quia Iesus uenit in carne et quia genuit eum Maria uerum deum...'"<sup>46</sup> This to be sure, may not be

are right. Such doubts as might derive from Courcelle (*Les lettres grecques en occident* [Bibl. des Écoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome, fasc. 159, Paris, 1948], 390 and n. 1) rest only on the general ground that he has found no evidence of Greek in Spain during the fifth century, not on the specific study of the poet himself, who lived and was educated largely in the fourth.

<sup>44</sup> Transl. Perkins, in *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, VIII, 206. This reading is confirmed by Ricciotti, *L'Apocalisse di Paolo siriana*, I, 72, whose text is based on two manuscripts in the Vatican, dated fourteenth and sixteenth century, respectively (I, 19-20).

<sup>45</sup> *Apocrypha anecdota* I, 34, 11.14-16.

<sup>46</sup> Silverstein, *Visio sancti Pauli*, 145, 11.12-13.

enough by itself to free Tischendorf's Greek from suspicion of *Tendenz*, though some will be in favor of doing so, and that has been the emphasis of this paper. But even should we hesitate in the end to grant that version grace,<sup>47</sup> we might then simply proceed to guess that the Tarsus edition itself was made, not after the Nestorian condemnation in 431, but in the decade immediately preceding.

However all that may be, Casey's view that the primitive original (the "first edition") was written, probably in Egypt, between the years 240 and 250, would still appear from all we know to be reasonable. That original was evidently free of serious heterodox taint, as the extant versions uniformly witness; we may hold to this judgment despite the appearance of some subsequent discomfort among those who suspected that it had heretical sources.<sup>48</sup> No doubt the lost book described as *ἀναβατικὸν Παύλου*, in use among the Cainites and possibly the Naassenes, was altogether different in character.<sup>49</sup> It was some form of the pre-Tarsus original that Origen and later St Augustine knew or knew about. From it, finally, may have been derived the surviving Coptic version and the closely related Ethiopic Apocalypse of the Virgin.<sup>50</sup> And this may be called the first stage of the history of the apocalypse.

In the fifth century the second stage begins. After the year 420 and shortly perhaps after 431 the apocalypse was reissued for circulation in the Roman East with a new preface disclosing its discovery in Tarsus and making reference (if we take this view) to the heresy of Nestorius. As time went on this form of the book was translated into Latin, Syriac, Old Church Slavonic, and Armenian and, carried East, lost the topical allusion, especially as it found favor with the later Nestorians. The Greek text itself was transmitted through the years, slightly shortened and modified,<sup>51</sup> to the thirteenth- and sixteenth-century manuscripts of Tischen-

<sup>47</sup> The alternative is that both forms of the passage in question had appeared earlier and referred to heresy of Ebionite or adoptionist stamp. This would make the variant insignificant nor is there evidence of its prior occurrence. Whether it was seen by the ninth-century writer of the second Long Latin text as specifically applicable to the Frankish and Spanish *Adoptivi* of his own day, who were accused of Nestorianism, is hard to assess; but the problem, hitherto unremarked, deserves attention.

<sup>48</sup> Cf., e.g., Sozomen's presbyter above, n. 34 and its context, and n. 40. See next note.

<sup>49</sup> There seems to be uniform agreement on this point and no reason to take another view. But to bracket the Naassenes with the Cainites as users, as does Casey (p. 27, n. 2), is not so certain. Hippolytus, *Refutatio omnium haeresium*, V.8 (*Werke*, ed. Wendland [Leipzig, 1916], III, 93), gives an account of the celestial gates in Naassene doctrine very like a passage in *Paul* (especially the Latin and Coptic versions), and it may be that our book is what they read. See Silverstein, *Visio sancti Pauli*, 94, n. 18.

<sup>50</sup> Casey, pp. 24-26; and Silverstein, *Visio sancti Pauli*, 20, 32-33, and 108-109, n. 80.

<sup>51</sup> For these modifications see especially Silverstein, *Visio sancti Pauli*, chap. 3, *passim*.

dorf's edition.<sup>52</sup> In the West the Long Latin version, made perhaps in the fifth or sixth century, gave rise from the ninth onward to a rich mediaeval development of Latin redactions and vernacular adaptations,<sup>53</sup> which constitute the main occidental tradition. Some time, however, before the middle of the twelfth century fresh contact with a Greek text seems to have been established to produce a new and independent Latin version, together with a German rendering based upon it.<sup>54</sup> These two traditions probably, but the major one at least,<sup>55</sup> continuing unbroken until the end of the Middle Ages, thus preserved the memory, however strangely transformed, of that edition of the book "discovered" beneath the apostle's house in Tarsus before the middle of the fifth century.

*University of Chicago.*

<sup>52</sup> *Apocalypses apocryphae*, XVI-XVII. See above, n. 25. An early fragment in large uncials (sixth century?) also survives, Bodleian Gr. th. g. 2 (P): see *Summary Catalogue of Western MSS*, vol. for nos. 31001-37299, p. 84, s.n. 31660.

<sup>53</sup> See Silverstein, *Visio sancti Pauli*, especially chap. 4; and 'The Vision of Saint Paul: New Links and Patterns in the Western Tradition,' *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du moyen âge*, XXVI (1960), 199-248.

<sup>54</sup> Silverstein, *Visio sancti Pauli*, 38.

<sup>55</sup> The language of the chief mediaeval texts goes back to that of the Long Latin, but it is not certain whether the independent Latin version is based on a Greek copy of the Tarsus edition, since it is a fragment and does not preserve the preface: *Visio sancti Pauli*, 149-52.

# Marc Bloch's Comparative Method and The Rural History of Mediaeval England

J. AMBROSE RAFTIS, C. S. B.

IN an unpublished letter of December 28, 1933, to Etienne Gilson who was to place his candidacy before the Collège de France, Marc Bloch explained the professional title under which he would lecture in that esteemed body: "My title is always the same, comparative history of European societies. I paused to ask whether for 'European' I might not substitute 'mediaeval'. I refuse to do so. I have no interest in the changing of labels, nor in clever labels themselves, or those that are thought to be so."<sup>1</sup> In such forceful words did Marc Bloch again and again identify himself as a comparative historian, that is, as he liked to say in the *Annales*, with the breaking down of walls between fields of specialization, with the insistence that the study of certain men in a certain historical society must open to the study of man in many forms of this society; the snapshot of man at a point of time must cede to the picture of man in the sequence of time.<sup>2</sup>

But just what does this mean in practical terms? Marc Bloch knew better than most the fundamental discipline required of a productive historian. As Lucien Febvre argued, Marc Bloch was a professional historian in the fullest scientific sense of the word: he could do the textual studies to be found in the *Capitulaire de villis*, criticize hagiographical sources in a manner worthy of the best Bollandist history (*Les rois thaumaturges*), or ponder and pore for months and years over village field maps (*plans parcellaires*).<sup>3</sup> Does not the selection and concentration upon detail required by these researches exclude the comparative study of European societies as a practical historical method? Or at least, must not comparative history wait upon more traditional historical investigations as its prerequisite?

<sup>1</sup> "Mon titre? Le même toujours: 'Histoire comparée des sociétés européennes.' Je me suis demandé au moment si à 'européennes' je ne substituerai point 'médiévales'. J'y ai renoncé. Je n'ai aucun goût pour les changements d'étiquette, ni pour les étiquettes habiles, ou que croient l'être." Archives, Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, Toronto.

<sup>2</sup> See especially the editors' introduction to the first two volumes of the *Annales d'histoire économique et sociale*, hereafter referred to as the *Annales*.

<sup>3</sup> See the letter of Febvre in Appendix below.

Marc Bloch's answer to questions of this type was a clear no! As he explained in his address to the Sixth International Congress of Historical Studies at Oslo, August, 1928, comparative history is not another chapter of material to be added to other histories; it is a *technique* basic to the growth of historical investigation itself.<sup>4</sup> By his insistence upon this word technique Bloch disassociated his comparative history completely from the doctrinaire methodology of the sociology of the nineteenth century.<sup>5</sup> For he insisted that as a technique comparative history does not make sense unless full value is given to the place of other techniques of the historian. That is to say, just as the natural sciences provide the necessary tools for man's control over nature but these tools must be formed and applied within the spirit of the arts and humanities, so the historian's scientific tools are essential to the exploitation of historical materials, but these tools must be directed by comparative history. Throughout time man leaves his imprint on matter, so that every device possible to the understanding of the non-human 'matter' of history must be employed. In consequence Bloch's insistence upon the study of diplomatics, paleography,<sup>6</sup> geology, geography,<sup>7</sup> meteorology, technology,<sup>8</sup> toponymy,<sup>9</sup> etc., was complementary to his insistence upon comparative history. In opening new facets of history, these sciences reveal the endless ingenuity of man. But, he insisted, all these sciences are still only the test tube stages, the material sources, for the history of

<sup>4</sup> 'Pour une histoire comparée des sociétés européennes', in *Revue de Synthèse Historique* (December, 1928), pp. 15-50. From this and other visits to Scandinavian countries Bloch received great encouragement towards the development of his ideas on comparative history (*Annales*, II (1930), pp. 83-5). For the pioneer character of such efforts by Scandinavian historians, especially with respect to revising history textbooks along a broader cultural base, see E. H. Dance, *History The Betrayer, a study of bias* (London, 1960), p. 127.

<sup>5</sup> In the *Annales* Bloch frequently insisted that a productive sociology must be based upon research in the contemporary period or in history, e.g. I (1929), p. 436; VIII (1936), p. 173.

<sup>6</sup> *Annales*, II (1930), p. 120.

<sup>7</sup> *Annales*, I (1929), p. 137: "Une méthode n'est jamais au point du premier coup; peu importe, si elle se perfectionne. Discuter, du point de vue de l'historien (mais l'historien et le géographe ne se rencontrent-ils pas dans une même préoccupation, dont les sociétés humaines forment l'objet?), quelques-uns des partis-pris de l'école géographique française, ce n'est pas diminuer les éclatants services que lui doivent les sciences de l'homme; c'est marquer notre confiance dans sa volonté de progrès et, par là, rendre hommage à son éternelle jeunesse." See also, *ibid.*, I, p. 607-8; VI (1934), pp. 81-5.

<sup>8</sup> *Annales*, III (1931), pp. 278-9.

<sup>9</sup> *Annales*, VI (1934), pp. 252-60: "...prouver que la toponymie, à elle seule, ne saurait permettre de résoudre les problèmes de peuplement. Il faut voir en elle moins un outil isolé qu'un des éléments d'une machine-outil, qui, d'un mouvement concerté, doit mettre en action ses diverses pièces." (p. 257).

man in society. Comparative history gives these sciences a true place in the history of man because comparative history is of humanist inspiration. As he went on to say in the above-mentioned congress at Oslo, this comparative technique is based upon the fact of the fundamental unity of man. The comparative method seeks as much to find parallels as differences among societies. Hence the comparative method is not content with finding sources as such; it is primarily interested in how these sources are to be questioned. Or, as he said more generally in *The Historian's Craft*, the historian moves on from sources by criticism, but at the bottom of nearly all criticism there is a problem of comparison.<sup>10</sup> Comparative history is first and foremost a critique of historical methodology.

Unfortunately, Marc Bloch was never able to leave us a complete study of his methodology for comparative history. *Les caractères originaux de l'histoire rurale française*,<sup>11</sup> although breaking new ground in the history of French rural society, was written too early in the development of Bloch's comparative methodology to be of much value beyond France. On the other hand, *The Historian's Craft* is too general, approximating more a philosophy of history than a methodology. A proper methodology only gradually appeared in an advanced and detailed fashion in Bloch's various writings in the *Annales* over the 1930's. In the course of this period Bloch made a detailed study of the writings of some half dozen countries. This methodology is illustrated here from only one of these areas of study, Bloch's critique of the rural history of mediaeval England.<sup>12</sup>

Over the greater portion of his life Marc Bloch was himself little disposed to a criticism of English historiography. As a French historian Bloch was able to envy the long tradition of detailed research in rural

<sup>10</sup> P. 110. Until the end of his life, however, Marc Bloch continued to associate difference with comparison, e.g. *Annales*, 1942-3 (II), p. 51: "D'autre part, il faut, cela va de soi, se garder soigneusement de confondre la méthode comparative avec le raisonnement par analogie. Elle exige au contraire, pour être correctement pratique, une grande sensibilité aux différences." It should be noted, perhaps, that nowhere does Marc Bloch claim for comparative history the exclusive humanist function of avoiding scientism among historians; he points out again and again how the individual man of ingenuity leaves his imprint in place and time. At the same time Bloch returns to emphasize that both from the scientific nature of historical methodology today, and from the fact that history proper is not the story of one man or of one point of time but of the 'changing story of men over time', the function of comparative history is basic to our search for the history of society.

<sup>11</sup> Paris, 1952 edition (reprint of 1931 edition).

<sup>12</sup> This article was first read as a paper to a session of the American Historical Association, December, 1960.



sources that had been incited and abetted for centuries in England by historical and political controversies — especially over the enclosures<sup>13</sup> — that were so encouraged by the extraordinary survivals in English archives, and that grew in strength over the nineteenth century with the support of public funds and the spread of scientific history. If he were able to survey the English scene in the second half of the twentieth century, Marc Bloch would be able to re-iterate his praise of this tradition as it continues to bear fruit in such works as the more recent volumes of the Place-Name Society, the Domesday Geographies of Darby, the Lost Villages of Beresford, the more critical volumes of the Victoria County Histories, the Cambridge Economic Histories, the Oxford Histories, or the phenomenal growth in popular interest in and professional care of county records.<sup>14</sup>

In addition, Bloch thought English historical studies to have been well launched into the comparative method in the late nineteenth century by Seebohm, Maitland,<sup>15</sup> and Vinogradoff.<sup>16</sup> And in this context he compared French scholars like Fustel de Coulanges unfavourably with Frederic Seebohm, for example, for having failed to recognize the existence of the open field system in France through dependence upon documents only.<sup>17</sup> The stature of men like Maitland and Vinogradoff apparently concealed for a time from the eyes of Marc Bloch something of the depth and nature of the English reaction against those comparative

<sup>13</sup> *Annales*, I (1929), pp. 60, 229-31; II, pp. 97ff.

<sup>14</sup> Marc Bloch used every opportunity presented by new English studies to stimulate the emulation of his fellow countrymen, e.g. *Annales*, II (1930), p. 557, upon the use of air photography in England but not in France; or *Annales*, VII (1935), pp. 216-17, upon the study by Knoop and Jones of the mediaeval mason in England, 'à quand le maçon français?'.  
<sup>15</sup> E.g. in a review of Maitland's *Collected Papers*, *Annales*, X (1938), pp. 138-9: 'Mais, conçue comme l'écrivait Maitland, l'histoire du droit est-elle autre chose qu'un chapitre, prodigieusement vivant, d'histoire sociale? Voyez, notamment, l'admirable article sur l'institution anglaise du 'trust', si étroitement liée à l'histoire des fortunes, à celle des sociétés économiques et à la consolidation de la liberté religieuse elle-même. Ennemis de toute cloison étanche, nous n'avons ici jamais cessé de déplorer le divorce qui, par une perte trop naturelle de l'esprit, tend presque constamment à s'établir entre l'étude des faits d'économie et celle de leur forme juridique; prétendre décrire la vie paysanne, par exemple, sans aborder le problème des droits de l'homme sur le sol n'est pas moins illégitime que de poursuivre une analyse de la propriété en dehors de toute connaissance des pratiques agraires.'

<sup>16</sup> At least until the last few years of his life, Bloch consistently associated his views upon the English seigneurie with the works of Vinogradoff.

<sup>17</sup> *Les caractères originaux de l'histoire rurale française* (Paris, 1952, reprint of 1931) pp. xi-xii.

histories of the nineteenth century that had turned upon a romantic concern for the 'origins' of European society. With this English criticism of the historians' concern for origins as such Bloch was in full agreement, and he reserved some of his most blistering epithets for the 'originist' approach: "In popular usage, an origin is a beginning which explains. Worse still, a beginning which is a complete explanation. There lies the ambiguity, and there the danger . . . So in many cases the demon of origins has been, perhaps, only the incarnation of that other satanic enemy of true history: the mania for making judgements."<sup>18</sup>

But the English reaction to nineteenth-century comparative history ultimately followed mainly the lines dictated by scientific research methods in the early part of this century: a concentration upon exposition of the national, regional, and local *differences* rather than parallels; an editing of texts and documents that fell within the framework of well-tried history textbooks, noticeably in economic, legal, and political history. The result has been an age of conformity in the ideas, problems, and controversies, for the last two generations of English historical writing. There is a wide variety of voices denouncing this conformity to-day. For example, there was the recent outburst of an Oxford don against 'an unconscious tendency to look at the mediaeval past from a monarchical point of view; . . . , to applaud kings as lions of justice, but to deplore barons as beasts of prey. And yet kings were not always just, nor barons invariably irresponsible.'<sup>19</sup> The fact that the

<sup>18</sup> *The Historian's Craft*, (translation, Manchester, 1954), pp. 30-1. Or see *Annales*, I (1929), p. 587 (in a comment on Italian village historians): "On a dit du manoir anglais que les savants lui ont découverts autant d'origines diverses que la Grèce, à Homère, de villes natales." Note, however, that Bloch did not disdain to entitle his book 'Les caractères originaux . . . '.

<sup>19</sup> See H. M. Colvin, 'Angevin Government', *History*, vol. XLIII (1958), p. 85: "There are, nevertheless, at least two cognate heresies to which medievalists have been prone. One is the traditional conception of a free peasant society gradually reduced to servitude by feudal pressure which has recently been under attack from more than one quarter. The other is an unconscious tendency to look at the medieval past from a monarchical point of view; to seek everywhere for signs of incipient royal power in just the same way as the Whig historians sought everywhere for signs of embryonic parliamentary authority; in short to concentrate attention on royal institutions . . ." Compare Marc Bloch, *Annales*, VIII (1936), p. 95: "Une des raisons qui sont souvent amené à mal comprendre la société médiévale est qu'hypnotisés par les relations de chef à dépendants — dont personne, naturellement, ne songera à nier l'importance — les historiens n'ont pas toujours accordés une attention suffisante à la force conservée par les liens du sang. Cela est vrai de l'histoire de la structure sociale proprement dite comme de celle de l'économie." A good summary of the heavily political framework of English histories may be found in E. H. Dance, *History The Betrayer*, pp. 56, 63, 78, 101.

most widely used volume on mediaeval English economic history to-day was first edited in much the same format in 1915 is often suggested as something of a measure for the length of the period of conformity. Another element of the picture is seen in the failure of sociology to establish a niche in the traditional centres of social history in England even though cognate disciplines employing the comparative methodology, such as the social anthropology of Radcliffe-Brown, have brought world renown to English scholars.<sup>20</sup>

From the early 1930's Marc Bloch began to criticize English writers more and more for a failure to employ the comparative technique. This remark upon the nature of research being done in monographs, written in 1931, was to become typical: "Nothing is better than to reconstruct gradually with the aid of a thousand little details based upon a wonderfully diverse reality an image of the whole that is more exact and much more nuancé; such is the ambition of all scientific research. But this ideal form of research, need one recall, ought to be pursued only on one condition: that the opposite direction is first taken — that before going from the particular to the general one inquires by a broad survey of the horizon the means by which may be classified and interpreted the accidental details of the countryside."<sup>21</sup> The English horizon, Bloch argues, is European. In a review of Miss Page's book on Crowland, for example, he expatiates at length on the theme that most questions of mediaeval English social history are also questions of European history and can only be resolved in that context. He heads this review satirically: 'En Angleterre, rien qu'en Angleterre'.<sup>22</sup> And the same type of critique is made of the Cambridge Mediaeval Histories,<sup>23</sup> Jolliffe,<sup>24</sup>

<sup>20</sup> This question has, of course, more complicated roots than the scope of this article allows. Despite Marc Bloch's sanguine estimate of English studies in the early twentieth century, French students found English writers more addicted to 'origins' than functions in their study of society *ca.* 1900, cf. A. R. Radcliffe-Brown, *Method in Social Anthropology* (Chicago, 1958), pp. 161-2, and Robert Redfield, *Peasant Society and Culture* (Chicago, 1956), pp. 19-20.

<sup>21</sup> *Annales*, III (1931), pp. 259-60.

<sup>22</sup> *Annales*, VII (1935), pp. 320-3.

<sup>23</sup> *Annales*, IX (1937), p. 390: "Plus encore qu'aux inconvénients d'une collaboration très dispersée, je pense, en écrivant ce mot, à l'impression d'échantillonnage que produit la juxtaposition de chapitres d'histoire nationale, conçus, en général, dans une forme tout à fait traditionnelle, avec d'autres études, plus neuves, consacrées aux divers aspects de la civilisation économique, religieuse, ou intellectuelle. Certainement, l'histoire universelle, si elle veut se renouveler, devra tendre à une fusion beaucoup plus intime de ces multiples éléments de la réalité.

<sup>24</sup> *Annales*, X (1938), p. 382: "Comme Stubbs, M. Jolliffe fait vraiment par trop abstraction de l'horizon européen."

Chrimes,<sup>25</sup> Stenton,<sup>26</sup> and others. By the late 1930's Bloch was pointing out how in some ways comparative history had ceased in England with Maitland and Vinogradoff. We read, in a review of Bennett's *Life on the English Manor*: "Besides, this poses in itself a problem, how exactly does the serf become distinguished from his free neighbour? I understand very well that Mr. Bennett has voluntarily refused to deal with this question. He considers it sufficiently elucidated by the research of Maitland, Vinogradoff, and their followers — with a little too much optimism, perhaps, for despite all we have learned from these justly celebrated works, I would not dare myself to say that the last word has been said."<sup>27</sup>

While Marc Bloch nowhere pulled these criticisms together into a systematic survey of the writings of English scholars on their mediaeval rural history, the direction that a critical history of English rural society should take is clearly indicated in these numerous articles and reviews over the 1930's. For our purposes Marc Bloch's comparative methodology may be briefly summarized in the following steps: 1) the student compares his particular field or area of investigation with a parallel field in another region, country, or continent, or perhaps only with the same area at another point of time;<sup>28</sup> 2) from this comparison new insights are obtained and new questions can be asked of the matter at hand; 3) with these questions in mind one looks again at his sources with the possibility of further use of these or other sources.<sup>29</sup>

The particular direction of this methodology may be more clearly seen in terms of its opposite; i.e. the exclusive choice of a fixed area for

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 384: "D'abord, l'horizon, à mon gré, beaucoup trop étroitement insulaire."

<sup>26</sup> *Annales*, III (1931), p. 595.

<sup>27</sup> *Annales*, X (1938), p. 147.

<sup>28</sup> *Annales*, VII (1935), p. 106: "Devant toutes les incertitudes de l'histoire corporative, il semble, nous dit-il, que le seul mode d'étude actuellement possible soit de se résigner modestement, humblement, à des recherches locales. D'accord, si le chercheur, grâce à une culture historique et économique étendue, a déjà par avance en main le questionnaire qui fera parler les textes." See also *Annales*, III (1931), p. 558; *Revue de Synthèse*, 1929-30, p. 46. And in *Les caractères originaux*, pp. IX-X and XIII-XIV on asking questions as related to breaking away from assumptions and seeing change in history. For reluctance by British historians to co-operate in comparative histories before 1945, see E. H. Dance, *History The Betrayer*, pp. 130, 137, 141.

<sup>29</sup> *Revue de Synthèse*, 1929-30, p. 20: "Avant l'interprétation des phénomènes, vient leur découverte... Ils ne nous sont connus et connaissables que par les documents; pour les voir surgir à la lumière, sous nos yeux, ne suffit-il pas de lire textes ou monuments? Sans doute, mais encore, faut-il savoir lire. Un document est un témoin; comme la plupart des témoins, il ne parle guère que lorsqu'on l'interroge. Le difficile est de dresser le questionnaire."

investigation, the limited questions inspired by analysis of materials in this area, the discard of many materials not responsive to these questions. The comparative methodology is therefore a three-pronged attack on the confines of categories, conclusions, and sources;<sup>30</sup> it is an effort to overcome that inevitable positivistic tendency of scientific methodology to equate history with the conclusions of its own discipline.

This hardening of the arteries, as Bloch was fond of calling the disease to be attacked by comparative history, is not a surface phenomenon, so that its diagnosis requires a more subtle probing of sources or of mere tracks of man in time:

"Moreover, these tracks which the past unwittingly leaves along its trail do more than simply permit us to fill in the narrative where it is missing and to check it where its truthfulness is suspected. They protect our studies from a peril more deadly than either ignorance or inaccuracy: that of an incurable sclerosis. Indeed, without their aid, every time the historian turned his attention to the generations gone by, he would become the inevitable prey of the same prejudices, false inhibitions, and myopias which had plagued the vision of those same generations. For example, the mediaevalists would accord but a trivial significance to communal development, under the pretext that the writers of the Middle Ages did not discuss it freely with their public, or would disregard the mighty force of religious life for the good reason that it occupied a much less important place in contemporary narrative literature than the wars of barons."<sup>31</sup>

For Marc Bloch's special field of investigation, social history, the legal document as a formulation that tends to obscure 'tracks' must first be challenged by the comparative historian:

"For example, we have 'the history of law.' The textbooks, always admirable tools of sclerosis, have popularized the term. But, what does it mean? A legal rule is a social norm, explicitly imperative, sanctioned by an authority capable of imposing respect by an exact system of compulsions and penalties. In practice, such precepts can govern the most diversified activities. They are never the sole means of controlling them: in our daily conduct, we are constantly complying with moral, professional, or fashionable codes which often make different demands from those of the code of the law. Moreover, the frontiers of the latter are constantly fluctuating; and, obviously, a socially recognized obligation does not change its nature simply by being inserted in the law, even if it can acquire more or less force or clarity thereby. Hence, law, in the strict sense of the word, is only the formal covering of realities which are in themselves too diversified to furnish profitable subject-matter for a single study. Moreover, it exhausts none of these realities. Take

<sup>30</sup> *Annales*, I (1929), p. 257: "Par fidélité à une classification désuète, renoncerons-nous éternellement à découvrir ces liens subtils et partout présents?"

<sup>31</sup> *The Historian's Craft*, pp. 62-3.

the family — whether it be a question of the small matrimonial family of today in a state of perpetual expansion and contraction or of the great mediaeval house, that community consolidated by such a lasting network of feelings and interests — for a true insight into its life, would it ever be sufficient simply to enumerate, one after the other, the articles of any family law? Some men seem to think so — how grievously they were deceived is sufficiently demonstrated by our inability to retrace the inward evolution of the French family even today.”<sup>32</sup>

The legal formulation is still typical of studies of English rural society in the Middle Ages too: the focus is the legal unit (manor), the legal man (lord or serf), the legal relationship (free or servile). Marc Bloch argues that to approach serfdom, or the life of the unfree villager, as a legal category leaves us in a historical limbo — a no man's land — since the serf is *neither free nor slave*, and it is difficult to reconstruct historical reality from negations.<sup>33</sup> Comparative history shows serfdom to have appeared in such a wide variety of countries and conditions that omnibus cultural or legal designations are inadequate. Comparative history directs us, therefore, to the study of serfs as individuals and groups with a life of their own. Such a study in England requires the intensive investigation of manorial court rolls. Marc Bloch sensed the wealth of material hidden in these court rolls,<sup>34</sup> although to my knowledge, he never had the opportunity to study them. And in this context, there is obvious proof of the necessity for the stimulating effect of

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 148-9. Marc Bloch's most detailed study of legal terminology as a professional language imposed upon social realities may be found in 'Serf de la Glèbe: Histoire d'une expression toute faite,' *Revue Historique* (1921), pp. 220-42.

<sup>33</sup> E.g. *Annales*, IX (1939-40), p. 439: "Qui dit serf dit — selon le vocabulaire de la France médiévale — personne censée dépourvue de la 'liberté'? De toute évidence, une pareille classification, appliqué à des hommes qui n'avaient rien de l'esclave, ne pouvait naître que dans une société qui, pratiquement, ignorait l'esclavage. D'où un premier problème: quels ont été, dans les diverses civilisations, les critères, infiniment variables, de ces deux notions, antithétiques et jumelées, de 'libre' et de 'non-libre'? *Annales*, 1942-3, p. 52: "Or, les hommes du moyen âge ont, certes, bien souvent hésité sur la question de savoir si tel ou tel statut personnel devait être tenu pour conforme, ou non, à la liberté. Ils ont, parfois aussi, quoique moins souvent, fait de ce mot de liberté un usage un peu incertain et, en quelque sorte, relativiste. Ils n'ont jamais conçu l'idée qu'il peut y avoir, entre la liberté et son contraire, un juste milieu. Ont-ils, en cela, manqué de subtilité? Je l'ignore et n'en ai, à vrai dire, nul souci. Mais une chose est sûre: l'expression ainsi forgée n'a de sens que par rapport à une notion toute moderne de la liberté. Sans valeur historique, donc, en elle-même, elle aboutit pratiquement à nous détourner de notre tâche essentielle, qui est de rechercher pourquoi, aux yeux des rédacteurs de chartes et de l'opinion qu'ils reflétaient plus ou moins gauchement, tel homme passait pour libre et tel autre non." See also, *Annales*, IV (1932), pp. 67-9.

<sup>34</sup> *Annales*, 1942-3, p. 106

comparative history in the recent complaint of Professor Plucknett that there is little interest in the publication of court rolls.<sup>35</sup>

The first step where such material is available is, argues Marc Bloch, the statistical approach: "For the moment, the question can only be posed; it touches on the least known aspect of our social evolution — we possess scarcely any precise study on parental lines in the Middle Ages — and I must confess that, for my part, I am far from seeing the solution. One thing is certain: only a series of careful researches bearing upon different types of social groups, and allowing as an essential condition the collection of statistical results, will throw some light on the obscure problem of mediaeval names and upon the prime historical problems that are so closely allied to this."<sup>36</sup>

How is one to move on from statistics to the study of local social groups? The time has come, Bloch said, to apply the techniques of students of primitive society to mediaeval Europe.<sup>37</sup> A glance at a collection of manorial court rolls for mediaeval England shows that he has manifest wisdom here. I have found, for example, that in an average eastern midland village more than two hundred names will be mentioned in court rolls around 1300, some of these names in one-half dozen contexts. As one penetrates the social structure revealed by these rolls, the lord-serf 'legal' relationship becomes decreasingly important. For instance, beneath the tenant holding from the lord there are a multitude of relations in land that are entirely unsuspected from the formal relation between lord and serf: the wife of a tenant has a real title to land, the kin of the tenant have various forms of blood ties to land, by private contract various forms of maintenance titles can be established in land, by private contract subletting is allowed, by private will and testament titles can be established to mobile goods of the tenant, by customary claims neighbours can have a right to mobile goods, and so forth.

These researches require a special dedication that was not in English historical studies of his time, Marc Bloch argued, owing to the

<sup>35</sup> *Brevia Placitata*, (Selden Society, 1951), p. LX, note 2.

<sup>36</sup> *Annales*, IV (1932), p. 69. Marc Bloch found that even studies of the noble class were not far advanced. He drew up an admirable scheme for this study (*Annales*, VIII, 1936, pp. 238-55, 366-78). But he was well aware that the comparative studies (*ibid.*, 239ff.) and co-operation (*ibid.*, p. 242) required for such a project would not be easily realisable. For these same reasons, no doubt, Bloch's masterly and imaginative studies in *La société féodale* (1939-40) reflect many of the limitations to be found in the traditional textbook presentation of this subject.

<sup>37</sup> *Annales*, II (1930), pp. 84-5.

precedence that political history took over social and economic questions.<sup>38</sup> The development of new areas in rural social history also requires an interest in non-conformity that is not usual among political and legal historians. As Marc Bloch exclaimed upon reading Elizabeth Levett's remarks that the estates of St. Alban's varied somewhat from the orthodox textbook pattern: "There is nothing orthodox, nothing geometric in mediaeval society, when one can see it as it actually was lived! Everywhere, on the contrary, there is a perpetual conflict of tendencies, a diversity which is in fact in the eyes of the historian the centre of interest."<sup>39</sup> And who is to say that the approach of Marc Bloch will not bring its rewards? Take for instance the notion of the community (family) as the heart of village life. What does that stubborn problem, the breakdown of the manor, mean in this community context? There is considerable evidence for movement of villeins away from their home manor from the late thirteenth century. Did not such mobility break down the village community family first, so that a breakdown in the villein demand for land and work was bound to follow, even without a Black Death? In short, was not rural depopulation from fourteenth-century England due to the breakdown of the traditional family community, (the rise of a form of peasant individualism, perhaps), as its first cause? These, and many parallel questions, are more than suggestions from the methodology of Marc Bloch. The whole notion of the village as a 'part-society' for example, a concept developed more and more fully over the past few years, offers an entirely new approach to the history of the mediaeval English village.

Marc Bloch's methodology is as challenging for the economic as for the social side of rural life. His basic complaint here is familiar to economic historians. That is, the common necessity of earning a living invites a common awareness and concern for things economic that easily leads to an assumption of professional knowledge. The particular problem in the mediaeval field is that most students approach the Middle Ages through literary studies whereas economic evidence is usually not

<sup>38</sup> *Annales*, IV (1932), p. 471. It is clear that Bloch found easy the effort to draw comparisons between several countries because he did not presume that the historical development of one country was 'better' than that of another, as he would say, particularly in comparative remarks about mediaeval England and France. For example, Marc Bloch was intrigued with the early enclosure of open fields on the continent as against England, and with the development of hereditary tenure by customaries in France but not in England. See especially 'Le problème des régimes agraires,' *Bulletin de l'Institut Français de Sociologie*, II (1932), pp. 88-9.

<sup>39</sup> *Annales*, 1942-3, p. 108.



literary.<sup>40</sup> The first economic knowledge is statistical, with a scientific genus of its own; but there is a danger that the same type of precision will be sought in statistical material as is to be lauded in a critical edition of texts.<sup>41</sup> Such a search for literary, or literal, precision in statistics leads to the discard of vast amounts of material. Since the time of Maitland, at least, some scholars have pleaded for a proper statistical approach to the vast amount of account roll material for English villages, but to little avail. We have more statistical material for agrarian production in England between 1250 and 1350 than in any comparable period before the eighteenth century, scholars like Professor Postan are prepared to argue. And yet recent books, such as the *Oxford History of England* in the fourteenth century, have to resort to studies of foreign trade in an effort to describe the economic conditions of a country largely agrarian and largely engaged in internal trade! The proper statistical approach to account roll materials would seem first of all to require some understanding of the notion of magnitude. That is to say, there is an indication in the gross statistical picture itself that is of value despite the scores of unanswered problems of detail. Secondly, statistical averages in mediaeval agrarian matters must be sought in comparables that the mediaeval clerks themselves compared, not in the research for a refined tool only to be found in a later age.<sup>42</sup>

<sup>40</sup> *Annales*, I, (1929), p. 584; II (1930), p. 470.

<sup>41</sup> *Annales*, VI (1934), p. 492: "A ce point que, longtemps, les historiens ont oscillé entre deux attitudes, également paresseuses: accepter pour argent comptant des documents, dont l'apparente précision n'est que trompel'œil; ou bien, niant toute possibilité d'observation exacte, se réfugier dans un confortable scepticisme. De même, naguère, aux érudits qui tenaient pour authentique tous les vieux diplômes..." See more generally, *The Historian's Craft*, pp. 119-20; and for Bloch's method for accepting certain inevitable imprecisions, *Annales*, I, (1929), pp. 64-5; II (1930), pp. 228-9. English scholars who appreciate the genuine need for putting mediaeval data into the stream of historical knowledge have, of course, admitted to the corresponding possibilities for errancy. E.g., in *The Domesday Geography of Eastern England*, p. 1, Darby makes a statement of J. H. Round his own: "No one who has not analyzed and collated such texts for himself can realize the extreme difficulty of avoiding occasional error. The abbreviations and the *formulae* employed in these surveys are so many pitfalls for the transcriber, and the use of Roman numerals is almost fatal to accuracy." (see Round, *Feudal England*, 1895, p. 20).

<sup>42</sup> *Annales*, VI (1934), p. 202: "... les seuls coefficients sur lesquels il soit permis de tabler sont ceux qui ont pu être de l'observation du milieu même. L'existence des variations de population et des vicissitudes de la structure sociale suffirait à prouver que ni le nombre des enfants par couple ni la composition des groupes familiaux (ascendants, descendants ou collatéraux vivant en communauté) ne sont des réalités stables dans le temps, pas plus que dans l'espace." *Annales*, 1942-3, p. 50: "L'exploitant moyen, l'exploitation moyenne seront toujours, au bout du compte, des mythes. Ce qui importe avant tout, c'est de savoir comment se répartissaient les différents degrés de fortunes terriennes."

There will be all sorts of questions still to be asked of a certain village, but surely it gives us a good start to know that there were at least two hundred villagers, so many thousand sheep, so many score horses and cattle, so many thousand bushels of corn harvested, etc. When we come to consider commutation of villein services, the renting of property, wages, or general prosperity, such magnitudes greatly help our sense of proportion.

This matter of a statistical approach is but part of a larger problem, the need for economic thinking on the part of the student of mediaeval things. There is a weakness, Bloch argues, in the approach to mediaeval economic institutions (profit, money economy, capital, etc.), and in their analysis solely from their mediaeval context. Since Bloch's time historians have traced an incipient economic analysis more and more to mediaeval thinkers, but this analysis was still incipient — many of the questions that we ask even to-day of underdeveloped countries were not considered in the Middle Ages. And as yet there appears no close relation between the rise of commercial and financial institutions and the development of a mediaeval economic analysis. Economic change in mediaeval times usually occurred beneath the surface of that life recorded by the literary records of the time.<sup>43</sup> Marc Bloch suggested, therefore, that the comparative method is a special requisite for the mediaeval economic historian. In this question of economic thinking the comparison should be upon a chronological rather than a contemporary basis. That is, we should move vertically back from the modern economic society to the mediaeval.<sup>44</sup>

<sup>43</sup> *The Historian's Craft*, p. 104, on how important elements of history are often the least observable.

<sup>44</sup> E.g. *Annales*, II (1930), p. 120: "Nous en revenons toujours au même refrain, monotone, sans doute: mais à qui la faute? Dans l'équipement de l'historien qui, aujourd'hui, aborde les phénomènes économiques, des outils excellents figurent, qu'il faudra bien se garder de laisser tomber: paléographie, diplomatique, toute la série des 'sciences auxiliaires', servantes traditionnelles de l'histoire, rien de mieux; nécessaires aussi, une bonne connaissance des faits politiques, une solide éducation de juriste. Mais à ce harnois, trop souvent, des armes, au moins aussi indispensables, font cruellement défaut: les sciences auxiliaires de l'économie (car elle en a, elle aussi) et plus encore l'habitude de penser en économiste: national-ökonomisch zu denken, comme disait le vieux maître Karl Bücher, — toute une initiation, en somme, que seul le contact avec les réalités du présent semble capable, sinon, sans doute, de donner sans autre secours, du moins de parfaire. A remplir ce vide de la formation présente des historiens, les *Annales*, dans la mesure de leurs forces, comptent s'employer." *Annales*, I (1929), p. 398: "Aussi bien, en histoire économique, qu'il s'agisse de documentation ou de recherches de fond, la tâche aujourd'hui la plus pressée est sans doute de poser les problèmes. Renseigner, certes, mais aussi questionner, voilà les buts mêmes de nos

But again, can this insistence upon statistics, social anthropology, and economic thinking, have any practical bearing upon studies of mediaeval rural England? All these new vistas suggested by the comparative methodology of Marc Bloch merely point to new areas of specialization and intensify the basic problem, the shortage of research personnel. And — the reverse of Parkinson's laws — as research specialization increases among historians, the shortage of specialists seems to increase in geometric proportions! Bloch was well aware of the only solution to this problem of division of labour among historians: the necessity for co-operation. Along with his belief in comparative history, Marc Bloch emphasized that if history is to advance upon all fronts as a science it must build co-operation into its very structure.<sup>45</sup>

This is a large question, and we can only mention a few aspects developed by Marc Bloch that may be of special interest to American historians. First, in England it is to be expected that the educational requirements of civic virtues will keep political history to the fore, and

enquêtes." It was from comparison with later periods that Bloch was lead to criticize Pirenne's famous theory of a natural economy in the west (*Mahomet et Charlemagne*): "Je me bornerai à répéter ce que j'ai déjà dit plusieurs fois: que le grand défaut de pareilles étiquettes est de conduire à se dispenser d'analyses véritablement poussées. La société sans monnaies ne serait-elle pas plutôt une société où la monnaie ne jouait pas le même rôle que plus tard? Les échanges étaient-ils vraiment absents ou ne s'opéraient-ils pas, en partie du moins, sans des formes différentes de celles auxquelles nous sommes habitués: comme prestations, par exemple, liées à la soumission à un pouvoir de commandement;" (*Annales* X, 1938, p. 229). Such chronological comparison could, of course, be employed in other areas than the economic, e.g. *Annales*, I (1929), p. 421; II (1930), pp. 1 and 562.

<sup>45</sup> For a general statement see *The Historian's Craft*, p. 69. But for Marc Bloch the insistence upon co-operation occurs with practically every point of stress upon comparative history. e.g. *Annales*, IV (1932) p. 493: "En dehors d'une collaboration de plus en plus étroite entre les divers procédés de recherche, pour les études humaines point de salut. Disons mieux — car chaque travailleur, pris à part, ne dispose jamais que d'une science limitée, ne dispose que d'une seule vie: — pourvus chacun de leurs armes propres, mais habitués à réfléchir en commun sur les buts communément poursuivis, résolus surtout à s'épargner la honte de s'ignorer entre eux, ce sont les chercheurs mêmes qui se doivent donner l'âme d'une équipe." Bloch's concern for the lack of co-operation among historians in Europe is still a critical question. For example, in the studies of works in economic history in England, France, and Germany presented to the American Economic History Association in September, 1958, the predominant criticism was the lack of co-operation among European historians. For some of this criticism, see *The Journal of Economic History*, XVIII, pp. 531ff. There is some increasing evidence of efforts by American scholars to overcome this lack of co-operation by comparative history, see Sylva Thrupp and W. T. Easterbrook in the same *Journal*, XVII, pp. 554-602. One of the striking new fields of international co-operation, in a field of traditional individualism, is The Institute of Research and Study in Medieval Canon Law in Washington.

that local antiquarian interests predominate in studies of rural history. Scholars from outside England will more easily turn to new areas or problems of investigation. In commenting upon *The Economic and Social History of an English Village* (Crawley), by N.S.W. and E.C. Gras of Harvard, Bloch says that this book has the singular quality of owing nothing in its inspiration to love of the home land.<sup>46</sup> And he goes on to discuss historians who write about their native villages: "Obeying pious sentiments of fidelity towards native soil and ancestors, it is especially for the instruction of the actual inhabitants of the village or of their immediate neighbours, that they usually attempt to describe a past whose relics and continuations lie all about them. Is it natural that they deliberately retain a large number of anecdotes that seen from a distance are very likely to appear of mediocre significance, (and) that they strive to neglect none of the glories of the little village... Every local monograph is, in this way, a monument to the dead." Marc Bloch's strictures upon local or national patriotism as it has a bearing upon the historian could, of course, be illustrated in many ways from among English historians. For example, Eileen Power<sup>47</sup> and Michael Postan<sup>48</sup> were considered by Bloch to have espoused the comparative approach, but neither succeeded in creating a school to turn back or compete with the prevalent conformity of their time.

While an international division of labour offered some hope for the comparative method, Marc Bloch clearly attributed much of the need for international co-operation to the failure of colleges and universities to overcome a system of enforced academic conformity in research. In 1931 he wrote: "the renaissance of our universities that raised so many hopes fifty years ago, has ended at making the Faculties of Letters at every degree and teaching level, preparatory schools for high school and college teachers. As for this narrow system of programmes and examinations that throttles us, I am not even sure that this preparation itself, so important for the education of the nation, gains very much; and I know well, as every one knows, all that the spiritual life of the university loses certainly in initiative, in facility of scientific production, and above all in the possibility of reform. A teaching that only obeys, how could it be

<sup>46</sup> *Annales*, V (1933), pp. 471-2.

<sup>47</sup> *Annales*, VI (1934), p. 510, where Bloch says that the inaugural lecture of Eileen Power is too much along the same lines as the methodology of the *Annales* to require comment.

<sup>48</sup> *Annales*, X (1938), p. 150. And on the co-operation of Power and Postan, "...quand l'organisation de notre enseignement, dit 'superior', permettra-t-il aux érudits de chez nous de grouper, pour des tâches pareilles, les bonnes volontés qui ne demandent qu'à s'offrir?" (*Annales*, VI, 1934, p. 318).

able to rejuvenate its methods?"<sup>49</sup> While Bloch felt it to be a moral obligation to criticize the French educational structure, and he obviously refrained from such attacks upon foreign education, it is clear from his reviews that he felt the problem to be wider than that of France.

It is interesting to be able to record that Marc Bloch had an intuition from the early 1930's that business as well as international co-operation had a role to play in intellectual research.<sup>50</sup> His prediction is surely borne out by the history of business in our countries over recent years. The tremendous development of business organization over the past decade has been possible, we are told, through the introduction of co-operation and flexibility in management.<sup>51</sup> These improvements in organization continue as business moves more and more into the field of research and education. Indeed, in December 1958 Peter Drucker expressed the belief that the organizational forms of the future will follow the organization of human knowledge.

How are we to assess the approach of Marc Bloch? Bloch would be one of the first to suggest that his own work is proof for the necessity of his critique. In a report to the International Conference of Historical Sciences on the transformation of demesne organization into commercial rents, for example, Bloch admitted that he was only able to suggest the possible lines of change as seen in the history of mediaeval France. But he went on to urge how comparison would help him to overcome his limitations.<sup>52</sup> Or again, after demonstrating in his study of a social class 'serf of the glebe' how legal formulation does not follow social facts in the

<sup>49</sup> *Annales*, II (1929), p. 559. And *Annales*, IX (1937), p. 85: "En face des merveilleuses réussites du laboratoire, au milieu des foules qu'étreignent les soucis de la pratique, nos disciplines, encore en bas âge, ne mènent qu'une pauvre petite existence menacée. Elles ne sauvegarderont leur droit à l'être qu'en nettoyant leurs productions de tout poids mort comme de tout trompe-l'œil." And especially the article in the same volume, 'Le problème de l'agrégation,' pp. 115-29. The problem is intellectual conformity (p. 116), even a type of despotism (p. 124), that can only be overcome by emphasizing antithesis: "A tort ou à raison, je puis bien, par exemple, estimer qu'il n'est qu'un moyen de faire saisir les originalités propres de la société féodale et seigneuriale française: la comparer à l'allemande et à l'anglaise... A tort ou à raison, je puis bien juger que les vieilles perspectives d'une histoire oratoire et politique ont cessé de répondre à ce que les hommes espèrent aujourd'hui de nos disciplines... Point d'audaces: c'est la devise qu'il semble inscrire sur toutes nos salles de cours." The system has its effect on the teacher also (p. 125) in the fall in production, stereotypes, manuals, etc.

<sup>50</sup> E.g. *Annales*, II (1930), pp. 1-2.

<sup>51</sup> See, for example, Bernard J. Muller-Thym, 'New Directions for Organizational Practices', ASME Report, 1960.

<sup>52</sup> *Bulletin des Sciences Historiques*, 1933, p. 126.

Middle Ages, Bloch was forced by the nature of his sources to employ legal sources for his very important work on another social class, the *colliberti*.<sup>53</sup> In even more subtle ways, however, Bloch was a victim of his own generation. For example, some of his best work in French history turned upon an analysis of the place of individualism in the decline of the feudal organization of early modern France. But Bloch adopted without question the nineteenth century historian's use of the word 'individualism' — while for the past two decades cultural anthropologists have been warning us that some re-appraisal of this term is required for its intelligent use. In *The Historian's Craft*, of course, Bloch admitted this problem of the inherited 'inflexibilities' of every generation of historians.<sup>54</sup>

Marc Bloch's failures are, then, ready proofs for the validity of his approach. And the revived interest in Bloch over recent years points to a more enduring need for his critique: the recognition of new auxiliary sciences for history, balanced by a sensitive awareness of the limits of the laboratory in 'human science'; the inexhaustible human problematic that must continue to break the bonds of historical methodology; the new criticism of nationalism, particularly under new approaches to periods of history. But perhaps most important to-day is Marc Bloch's persistent question, 'where does the historian acquire a co-operative soul?' And we find ourselves addressing along with him the query: must our society fail to acquire a sense of history through the failure of historians to co-operate? Marc Bloch's own answer always came back in the same way, for it came from the inner soul of one of the greatest humanists of the twentieth century. The answer came in the challenging question of comparative history: is it too much to ask that to do better history, historians should become more human?

<sup>53</sup> 'Les *Colliberti*, Etude sur la formation de la classe servile', *Revue Historique* (1928), especially p. 2.

<sup>54</sup> Pp. 17-18.

## APPENDIX

## A LETTER OF LUCIEN FEBVRE ON MARC BLOCH\*

Mon cher Gilson,

Voici deux ou trois mots, qui ne vous apprendront pas grand'chose. Mais qui vous appuieront du dehors dans votre travail de mise au point. J'écris le tout au courant de la plume: c'est l'expression, tout simplement, de la façon dont un manœuvre d'histoire voit son travail, et les problèmes qu'il pose. A ce titre, cela peut vous être tout de même de quelque utilité.

Bien à vous, et, en tant qu'historien, merci de travailler à nous bien outiller en hommes comme vous le faites,

(signed) Lucien Febvre.

I Peut-être serait-il bon de marquer d'un mot qu'il y a à la base des travaux de Marc Bloch une œuvre d'*érudit* très précise et minutieuse: critique de textes (*Capitulaire de Villis*); publication critique d'un texte hagiographique (chez les Bollandistes, bons garants); travaux personnels sur les plans de terroirs qui, en France, ont ouvert la voie?

II D'un mot aussi, peut-être — (et comme on insistera sans doute sur le rôle directeur d'une chaîne d'Antiquités nationales organisant le travail d'érudition locale) — il serait bon de montrer que ces dernières enquêtes et, d'une façon générale, les interventions de Marc Bloch dans le domaine de l'histoire rurale, les enquêtes et les mises au point qu'il ne cesse de publier d'accord avec moi dans nos *Annales* (organisation *par le dedans* des études régionales, des études locales, des monographies de provinces, de villes, de villages attentivement critiqués dans un esprit positif; organisation, pareillement, des études de *toponymie* appliquées à l'histoire de peuplement, des enquêtes de *technique* agraire, etc.) — tout cela a de plus en plus de retentissement, attire à nous de plus en plus ces collaborateurs indispensables de toute recherche d'histoire locale que sont les Archivistes départementaux, les Bibliothécaires municipaux, les présidents et secrétaires des grandes sociétés d'histoire locale qui sans cesse recourent à nous et en particulier à Bloch, lui communiquent des plans, des projets, des documents. Rayonnement qui, grâce aux enquêtes des *Annales* sur les plans parcellaires hors de France, s'étend et s'élargit sur l'étranger.

III A ce point de vue, les rapports de M. Bloch avec l'Institut d'Étude comparée des Civilisations à Oslo — ses toutes récentes conférences de Londres sur un thème d'histoire comparée: *Seigneurie française et seigneurie anglaise* sont à signaler spécialement je crois; ces dernières jugées assez utiles pour devoir être publiées prochainement en Angleterre, et en anglais.

\* The following remarks were written on five sheets bearing the letterhead of the *Annales*. Although undated, from the context of events the letter would have been written in 1934, sometime before April. The italics are those of Lucien Febvre.

Naturellement, faites de ceci ce que vous voulez ! On conçoit son exposé *d'un jet*, et il ne faut pas l'aloudir en greffant sur son texte des développements plus ou moins parasites. C'est en pensant à des arguments possibles "d'en face" que j'ai noté ces contre-parties. Et pas pour le besoin de la cause ! Il est certain que Bloch est *très connu* à l'étranger, il est un des très rares historiens français d'aujourd'hui qui y sont connus. Il est non moins certain que grâce à nos *Annales*, sa pensée toute voisine de la mienne sur tous les points essentiels (mais cela, il ne faut pas le dire ! et il faut me maintenir dans l'ombre la plus noire !) est en train d'agir de plus en plus largement sur les milieux d'érudits et d'historiens français qu'il y a tout lieu de secouer et de réveiller. Il a parfaitement pris son rôle d'introducteur des provinciaux plus ou moins autodidactes, dans le courant d'une histoire générale nourrie d'apports étrangers, fécondée par l'esprit de comparaison, riche non seulement d'observations étroitement nationales, mais de références à des évolutions très différentes de celles que nous connaissons — ou croyons connaître. Histoire, science d'un changement. Dans le temps, dans la ligne *verticale*. Mais dans l'espace non moins, sur la ligne *horizontale*. Et d'autant plus intéressant, celui-là, qu'un déplacement latéral s'accompagne *toujours* d'un décalage en profondeur. Car deux sociétés juxtaposées, saisies au même moment de la durée, ne sont jamais contemporaines. Et tout le problème d'une histoire de relations des groupes humains entre eux consiste en ceci précisément, que ces groupes, parce qu'ils vivent à la même époque, sont les bénéficiaires d'une civilisation matérielle à peu près identique (à peu près, car enfin, il y a un style des objects qui les fait tout de suite identifier comme appartenant à telle ou telle nation; une *Maxim* n'est pas un *Saint-Etienne*; une *Fiat* n'est pas une *Ford*; et dans le domaine de l'outillage le plus élémentaire, que de différences dans la façon d'emmancher, d'empoigner, d'utiliser les outils les plus communs: mais ceci est une autre histoire); ces groupes disposent donc, pour réaliser leur fins, d'une dotation matérielle à peu près semblable; leur fins: mais ces fins ne sont pas celles du voisin; non parce qu'elles s'opposent, simplement, aux fins du voisin, mais parce qu'elles en diffèrent en nature, en esprit, en qualité; et que ces différences tiennent à des différences de passé qui nous fait dire de tel pays qu'il est en *avance*, ou tel autre qu'il est en retard sur tel autre. D'où le drame. Le drame des relations franco-allemandes depuis des siècles, pour ne citer que celui-là. L'histoire "comparée", c'est cela, ce doit être cela. Non seulement saisir un *changement*. C'est déjà quelque chose de fécond, la constatation brute d'une différence. Mais expliquer ce changement. L'expliquer à la fois par l'espace et par le temps. En combinant l'espace et le temps. Et sous la surface glacée d'une "Europe en 1270" ou d'un "Europe en 1815" (telle que nous la présentent nos Atlas scolaires, avec leurs teintes plates) nous montrer les *hauts* et les *bas*, nous restituer l'aspect de mosaïque défaite, avec les petits carrés enfoncés ou surélevés que présente tout ensemble de sociétés humaines, employant les mêmes mots pour définir des institutions d'*esprit* différent, et se référant à des couches chronologiques, à des couches de terrain différentes.

Tout ceci que vous savez aussi bien que moi. Mais j'en donne ma traduction en langage d'historien, telle quelle, à titre de référence pour vous, avec ce qu'elle a de *gros* pour le théoricien, et ce qu'elle peut avoir de *dynamique* pour l'ouvrier d'histoire. — Au vrai, ce qui d'un pays à un autre pays se ressemble — c'est la "*culture*", au sens allemand du mot. Ce qui diffère profondément, c'est la *structure sociale* — et l'*idéologie*, mot absurde, mais nous n'avons le choix qu'entre des mots absurdes: mentalité, etc. — Se transporter d'un pays dans un pays voisin, à la même date, ne suffit pas. On constate des différences d'outillage; mais elles sont allées en di-



minuant. Et ce qui leur donne un sens, ce sont les différences de mentalité. La façon de s'en servir... qui se reflète dans la texture intime des sociétés, filles de leurs temps et filles du passé. Voilà ce qui révèle l'histoire "comparée": des différences de texture, de structure — qui se résolvent en différences d'esprit — et qui s'expliquent, en définitive, accessoirement par des différences de milieu "géographique" ou naturel; fondamentalement par des différences d'évolution historique (le milieu géographique ou "naturel" étant pour une large part un milieu "humain"). Pour ces problèmes-là, qui sont en un sens les plus hauts problèmes du passé humain — on ne le peut pas en s'enfermant dans les limites d'un seul pays. On ne le peut qu'en s'étant assoupli l'esprit par une longue pratique de la comparaison — de la comparaison qui est notation de différences en *surface*, et, surtout, de différences en *profondeur*... Et c'est cela précisément, qu'apporte Bloch. En lui-même. Et dans un enseignement qui de par les nécessités (?) (sic) des programmes et des concours publics, ignore totalement ces démarches intellectuelles.

*Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies*

# Mediaevalia

## THE SOURCE OF CHAUCER'S "RUSTED GOLD"

In discussing the Parson's proverb in Chaucer's prologue to the *Canterbury Tales*, "That if gold ruste, what shal iren do?" G. L. Kittredge notes a parallel line in the *Roman de Carite* but suggests as a common source, Lamentation 4:1 as interpreted by Gregory the Great in *Pastoral Care*.<sup>1</sup> However, the biblical basis for the figure of rusted gold appears to have a wider foundation than the single verse of Jeremiah's lament. Further, other ecclesiastical writers employ the same image, and their usage seems to be an adaptation of a scriptural idea. Hence, it appears preferable to assign a patristic source to Chaucer's rusted gold.

Among ecclesiastical writings one can find these examples:

Alan of Lille, who died in 1203, in *Distinctiones Dictionum Theologicalium* notes, "Aurum dicitur claritas innocentiae, unde in Thren., 'Quomodo obscuratum est aurum,' id est claritas innocentiae versa est in nigredinem culpae."<sup>2</sup> Paschasius Radbertus, a ninth century theologian, comments in *Expositio in Lamentationes Jeremiae*, "Per aurum namque obscuratum reprobam electorum seu sacerdotum vel ministrorum Dei in diversis ordinibus deplorat vitam, quondam per gloriam virtutum claram, nunc vero per actiones infimas et negotia saeculi obscuratum: ac deinde color optimus fertur immutatus, quia ille sanctitatis nostrae habitus, per terrena et abjecta praesentis vitae opera, ad ignominiam despectionis venit."<sup>3</sup> Another ninth century theologian, Rabanus Maurus, states in *Allegoriae in Scripturam Sacram*, "Aurum, vita sacerdotis, ut in Jeremiae: 'Quomodo obscuratum est aurum,' quod splendida sacerdotum vita vitiis deturpatur."<sup>4</sup>

Pope Gregory the Great, who died in 604, in his *Pastoral Care* uses the Lamentations passage to illustrate the effect of priestly holiness lost. He explains the phrase in this way: Quid namque auro, quod metallis caeteris praeeminet, nisi excellentia sanctitatis? Quid colore optimo, nisi cunctis amabilis reverentia religionis exprimitur?... Aurum igitur obscuratur, cum terrenis actibus sanctitatis vita polluitur. Color optimus commutatur, cum quorundam qui degere religiose credebatur, aestimatio anteacta minuitur. Nam cum quilibet post sanctitatis habitum terrenis se actibus inserit, quasi colore permutato ante humanos oculos ejus reverentia despecta pallescit.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> G. L. Kittredge, "Chaucer and the 'Roman de Carite,'" *MLN*, XII (1892), 113-115. In the *Roman*, a late twelfth century work by the Renclus of Moiliens, the author queries in a long exhortation to parish priests, "Se ors enrunge, queus ert fers"?

<sup>2</sup> Jacques Paul Migne, ed. *Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Latina*, 210 (Paris, 1855), 715. That Chaucer knew the writings of Alan of Lille, cf. Thomas R. Lounsbury, *Studies in Chaucer* (New York, 1892), II, 344-352.

<sup>3</sup> Migne, 120 (1879), 1198.

<sup>4</sup> Migne, 113 (1878), 870.

<sup>5</sup> Migne, 77 (1896), 40. Gregory's *Pastoral Care* was also known through an Old English translation by King Alfred, who died in 901. The translation of the passage under discussion speaks of "gold adeorcad" and "gold asweartod," that is, "dimmed" and "darkened." The Old English "rust" and "rustig" are not used. Cf. King Alfred, *Gregory's "Pastoral"*, ed. Henry Sweet, Early English Text Society, Original Series, 45 (London, 1871), 132.

These patristic quotations show how readily ecclesiastics used tarnished or rusted gold to describe a priest fallen from holiness, and referred to Lamentations as a scriptural basis. In this light the usage of Chaucer's Parson is in accord with Church tradition. However, the image of tarnished gold or silver is found in several prophetic passages as well as in the New Testament. Consider these verses of the Vulgate:

Quomodo obscuratum est aurum, mutatus est color optimus. (Lamen. 4:1).

Argentum reprobum vocate eos, quia Dominus projecit illos. (Jer. 6:30).

Argentum tuum versum est in scoriā. (Isaias 1:22).

Filii hominis, versa est mihi domus Israel in scoriā, omnes isti aes et stannum et ferrum et plumbum in medio fornacis scoria argenti facti sunt. (Ezech. 22:18).

Aufer robiginem de argento et agredietur vas purissimum. (Prov. 25:4).

Aurum et argentum vestrum aeruginavit, et aerugo eorum in testimonium vobis erit, et manducabit carnes vestras sicut ignis. (James 5:3).

These passages from five biblical authors illustrate the appeal of describing moral decadence as rusted or tarnished precious metals. The image has a general application: the words of Jeremias, Isaias and Ezechiel are directed toward the people of Sion, the Israelites; Proverbs does not specify its subject of address; James is speaking to the rich. The rusted metal image was referred a fortiori by patristic writers to priests and bishops — what is true for the people in general should hold even more for the spiritual leaders. Chaucer accords with this patristic convention by his use of rusted gold. The single passage of Lamentations with its general application to the Israelites does not appear to be the sole biblical foundation for comparing priestly lack of holiness to rusted gold. Rather reference must also be made to additional verses in which the same idea as rusted gold is expressed under slightly different imagery. Especially to be considered is the passage in James where the inspired author uses "rusted" (*κατιῶται*) to describe the gold, whereas Lamentations speaks merely of its growing dim.

However, Chaucer's rusted gold refers to the priest (bishop) alone — rather than the people in general; the texts quoted from Paschasius Radbertus, Rabanus Maurus and Pope Gregory have the same reference as Chaucer's image. This idea of rusted gold referring to the clergy is not explicitly had in the scriptural passages. The idea is an a fortiori application by patristic writers. It might even be called an allegorical interpretation, which is hinted at by the title of Maurus' work, *Allegoriae in Scripturam Sacram*. That these writers quoted Lamentations 4:1 in support of their interpretation does not thereby make it the source of Chaucer's passage. As has been pointed out, the biblical image is found in places other than Lamentations.

Because the patristic usage represents an adaptation of the biblical image, it seems preferable to assign a patristic source to Chaucer's words. No specific Father need be chosen. If, however, one is desired, Pope Gregory could be selected on the basis of his antiquity, Chaucer's knowledge of him as shown in the *Parson's Tale*, and the diffusion of the *Pastoral Care* through King Alfred's Old English translation. However, this specific determination need not be made. The image of rusted gold to illustrate priestly decadence is a patristic illustration.

## THE USE OF WILLIAM OF MOERBEKE'S RECENSION OF THE "POSTERIOR ANALYTICS": A SECOND INSTANCE

Since the rediscovery of the recension (very likely by William of Moerbeke) of an earlier Latin translation of Aristotle's *Posterior Analytics*,<sup>1</sup> the only commentator on Aristotle known to have made use of the recension has been Saint Thomas Aquinas.<sup>2</sup> That Aquinas should be the only *expositor* of his day to take advantage of Moerbeke's improvements in the translation of this difficult work has not seemed surprising, especially in view of the statements by several medieval writers that William made his translations "*ad instantiam fratris Thomae*".<sup>3</sup> The apparent uniqueness of Thomas in using this work has given contemporary Thomistic scholars an opportunity to emphasize once more Aquinas' extraordinary concern to grasp the *intentio Aristotelis*,<sup>4</sup> in contrast, we might be led to think, other medieval commentators were less painstaking in their study of Aristotle.

The limited circulation of the Moerbekian recension<sup>5</sup> suggests that either this

<sup>1</sup> The rediscovery was made by Lorenzo Minio-Paluello, who has brought forth considerable evidence for the attribution to Moerbeke: see his 'Note sull' Aristotele latino medievale: V. L'ignota versione moerbekana dei 'Secondi Analitici' usata da S. Tomaso,' *Rivista di filosofia neoscolastica*, 44 (1952), pp. 389-397 [hereafter cited as Minio-Paluello, "L'ignota versione..."]. The same scholar has identified the earlier Graeco-Latin translation (*versio communis*) upon which Moerbeke based his recension as a work of the twelfth-century translator, James of Venice: see his 'Iacobus Veneticus Grecus: Canonist and Translator of Aristotle,' *Traditio*, 8 (1952), pp. 265-304 [hereafter cited as Minio-Paluello, "Iacobus Veneticus Grecus..."].

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Etienne Gilson, *The Christian Philosophy of St. Thomas Aquinas with a Catalogue of St. Thomas's Works* by I. T. Eschmann, O. P., translated by L. K. Shook, (New York, 1956), p. 401. Cf. also Daniel A. Callus, 'Les sources de saint Thomas. Etat de la question.' in *Aristote et Saint Thomas d'Aquin: Journées d'études internationales*. Chaire Cardinal Mercier, 1955. (Louvain and Paris, 1957), pp. 110-111.

<sup>3</sup> Cf., e.g., the Catalogue of Stams: see G. Meersseman, ed., *Laurentii Pignon Catalogi et Chronica accedunt Catalogi Stamsensis et Upsalensis Scriptorum O.P. Monumenta Ordinis Fratrum Praedicatorum Historica*, 18. (Rome, 1936), p. 62. For a discussion of other sources which attribute the initiation of Moerbeke's work to Aquinas, see Martino Grabmann, *Guglielmo di Moerbeke O. P. il traduttore delle opere di Aristotele*. *Miscellanea Historiae Pontificae*, 11 (Rome, 1946), pp. 62-84.

<sup>4</sup> Cf., e.g., the remarks of Callus, *op. cit.*, p. 111: Il semblerait que cette révision [sc. of the *Posterior Analytics* by William of Moerbeke], malgré sa supériorité indéniable n'a été utilisée que par S. Thomas, dont le souci constant, dans son interprétation d'Aristote, a été de saisir le sens exact et complet de la *littera Aristotelis*. C'est dans ce but qu'il a voulu se procurer une traduction aussi exacte que possible. Nous avons là une nouvelle preuve — si elle était nécessaire — de la collaboration intime entre Guillaume de Moerbeke et S. Thomas...

<sup>5</sup> Thus far only two manuscripts of the work have been identified: MS Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, lat. 16080, fol. 95<sup>v</sup>-112<sup>v</sup> (formerly in the possession of Godfrey of Fontaines) and MS Venice, Biblioteca nazionale marciana, lat. VI, 145, fol. 253<sup>v</sup>-294<sup>r</sup>. Readings from the Moerbekian recension are found along with the *versio communis* in a third manuscript: MS Florence, Biblioteca mediceo-laurenziana, *Leopold. Med. Fesul.*, 170. fol. 230<sup>v</sup>-280<sup>r</sup>. In contrast,

version was a "private" edition made for Aquinas or that other readers and commentators of Aristotle were, for the most part, not sufficiently interested to obtain a copy of the work. There is no evidence for the first alternative. What evidence is there for the second? We have noted above (see note 5) that Godfrey of Fontaines once owned the Parisian manuscript of the Moerbekian recension. While it is clear from Godfrey's autograph notes in the margin that he was one reader, at any rate, who carefully studied this text,<sup>6</sup> he has left us no comment on the *Posterior Analytics* other than these random notes.

The question whether Saint Thomas was the only Aristotelian commentator to use Moerbeke's recension is not an unimportant one. The *Posterior Analytics* was not only one of the most difficult<sup>7</sup> of the Aristotelian texts that medieval scholars had to study, but it was also one of the most important. It was from this work that scholastic philosophers and theologians drew much of their notion of science and the conditions required for it.<sup>8</sup> If Thomas were the only commentator to avail himself of Moerbeke's revision, then we would have evidence that his efforts to reach the precise meaning of an important Aristotelian text were greater than those of most of his contemporaries. Since the general estimate of an earlier thinker which modern historians arrive at is very much influenced by an accumulation of such facts, it is important to determine, if possible, whether Thomas was unique in his use of this work.

In the course of studying the anonymous *Questions on the Posterior Analytics* attributed to Boetius of Dacia,<sup>9</sup> I noted that the author used a second translation of the

over 270 manuscripts of James of Venice's translation are known, cf. the index of *Aristoteles Latinus: Codices, pars posterior* (Cambridge 1955), p. 1343, and also Minio-Paluello, 'L'ignota versione...', pp. 390-391 (on the MSS of the Moerbekian recension) and p. 396 (on the MSS of James of Venice's translation).

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Minio-Paluello, 'L'ignota versione...', pp. 390-391. It should be added, however, that Godfrey's marginal notes do not extend beyond fol. 103<sup>v</sup> (= Book I, ch. 24 of the *Posterior Analytics*).

<sup>7</sup> The assimilation of the *Posterior Analytics* by the medieval schools took almost a hundred years (roughly from the middle of the twelfth to the middle of the thirteenth century): longer, perhaps, than any other work of Aristotle. The comments of John of Salisbury at the beginning of this period in his *Metalogicon* on the difficulty of the work are well known and need not be repeated here, see Bk. IV, ch. 6, ed. C. C. I. Webb (Oxford, 1929), pp. 170-171; English translation in Daniel D. McGarry, *The Metalogicon of John of Salisbury* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1955), p. 212. The *Metalogicon*, finished in 1159, is the first medieval Latin work to show a first-hand knowledge of the *Posterior Analytics*; it is likely that a Latin translation was not in circulation much earlier than ca. 1145, cf. Minio-Paluello, 'Iacobus Veneticus Grecus...', p. 270, n. 13.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. the excellent discussion of James A. Weisheipl, *The Development of Physical Theory in the Middle Ages*. Newman History and Philosophy of Science Series, No. 4. (London and New York, 1959), pp. 23-26. On the relation of the Aristotelian notion of science to theology, see M.-D. Chenu, *La théologie comme science au XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle*, (3rd ed. Paris, 1957), especially chapter 5: "La science théologique", pp. 67-92.

<sup>9</sup> The correctness of this attribution cannot be examined here. It should be pointed out, however, that the evidence that these questions are the work of Boetius of Dacia rests on little more than their association in the same manuscripts with known authentic works of the same author. The earliest discussions of the authorship of these questions centered

Aristotelian text. In Book I, question 6, the solution (see MS Bruges 509, fol. 60<sup>r</sup> b8-9 and cf. MS Erlangen 213, fol. 84<sup>v</sup>b46-47), the author leaves no doubt of this: "... et propter hoc dicit Aristoteles quod omnis doctrina et omnis disciplina intellectiva et ratiocinativa secundum aliam translationem".<sup>10</sup> The opening sentence of the *versio communis* (by James of Venice) reads in MS Oxford, Balliol College 253, fol. 211<sup>v</sup>4-6: "Omnis doctrina et omnis disciplina intellectiva ex preexistente fit cognitione".<sup>11</sup> The anonymous Graeco-Latin translation preserved only in MS Toledos Bibl. Capit. 17.14 and now published in the *Aristoteles Latinus* series reads: "Omni, didascalia et omnis disciplina deliberativa ex preexistenti fit cognitione".<sup>12</sup> The same sentence in the Arabo-Latin translation of Gerard of Cremona reads: "Omnis doctrina et omnis disciplina cogitativa non fit nisi ex cognitione cuius precedit esse".<sup>13</sup>

on the text found in MS Bruges, Bibliothèque de la ville 509, fol. 59<sup>r</sup>-75<sup>v</sup>, which was until 1952 the only known manuscript. See Barthélemy Hauréau, "Boetius, maître ès arts à Paris," *Histoire littéraire de la France*, 30 (Paris, 1888), p. 278. Martin Grabmann in his *Neu aufgefundenen Werke des Siger von Brabant und Boetius von Dacien*. Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-philologische und historische Klasse, Jahrgang 1924, 2. Abhandlung. (Munich, 1924), pp. 34-35, expressed some doubts about the attribution, but this was before he had examined the Bruges manuscript. Later he accepted the attribution and published a single question from the work under Boetius' name in his article, "Texte des Martinus von Dacien und Boetius von Dacien zur Frage nach dem Unterschied von Essentia und Existencia," *Miscellanea philosophica R. P. Josepho Gredt OSB completis LXXV annis oblata*. [= *Studia Anselmiana*, fasc. VII-VIII]. A second manuscript, MS Erlangen, Universitätsbibliothek 213 (Irmischer 485), fol. 84<sup>r</sup>-101<sup>v</sup>, was identified (apparently independently) by Heinrich Roos; see his *Die Modi Significandi des Martinus de Dacia: Forschungen zur Geschichte der Sprachlogik im Mittelalter. Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie und Theologie des Mittelalters*, Vol. 37, No. 2 (Münster and Copenhagen, 1952), pp. 125-126, n. 2 and J. J. Duin, *La doctrine de la providence dans les écrits de Siger de Brabant, Textes et Etude*. Philosophes Médiévaux, Vol. 3 (Louvain, 1954), pp. 196-197, n. 62. Considering the limited evidence at present available the wisest course would surely be to leave open the question of authorship.

<sup>10</sup> The reading is that of the Bruges manuscript. The Erlangen manuscript reads: "...et propter hoc dicit auctor omnis doctrina et disciplina intellectiva uel ratiocinativa secundum aliam translationem..."

<sup>11</sup> The Balliol manuscript along with MS Glasgow, Hunterian U.6.10 (cf. fol. 29<sup>r</sup>1-3) represent, according to Minio-Paluello, "the 'vulgate' in a pure or almost pure form" (see Minio-Paluello, 'Iacobus Veneticus Grecus...', p. 282, n. 36). Besides the extract from the Balliol manuscript printed in *Aristoteles Latinus: Codices*, pars posterior (Cambridge, 1955), p. 792, I have consulted a microfilm copy of both manuscripts. A critical edition of the *versio communis* has not yet been published. The "vulgate" Latin texts of the *Posterior Analytics* printed in the Leonine edition of Saint Thomas' exposition and among the works of Manlius Boethius in PL, Vol. 64, can be regarded only as uncritical witnesses of the *versio communis*. On the (false) attribution of the text in PL, Vol. 64 (col. 711-762) to Manlius Boethius, see Minio-Paluello, 'Iacobus Veneticus Grecus...', pp. 299-303. On the origin of both the Leonine and PL texts, see Minio-Paluello, 'L'ignota versione...', pp. 396-397.

<sup>12</sup> Laurentinus Minio-Paluello, ed., *Analytica Posteriora: Translatio anonyma. Aristoteles Latinus*, Vol. IV, Part 2 (Bruges and Paris, 1953), p. 7, ll. 3-4.

<sup>13</sup> *Id.*, *Gerardo Cremonensi interprete*, Vol. IV, Part 3 (Bruges and Paris, 1954), p. 3, ll. 4-5.

The Moerbekian recension reads: "Omnis doctrina et omnis disciplina *ratiocinativa* ex preexistenti fit cognitione".<sup>14</sup> It is clear, then, that the "*alia translatio*" cited by the author of the anonymous questions is the Moerbekian recension since it is the only Latin translation that reads "*ratiocinativa*".

A study of the twenty *lemmata* found in both the Bruges and Erlangen manuscripts has not revealed any further undeniable uses of the Moerbekian recension. This was hardly to be expected since the work is not a literal commentary but a series of questions in which the *lemmata* serve merely as a guide for the reader to show roughly the place in the text which has relevance to the matter being discussed. On the other hand, in a literal commentary, such as Saint Thomas', the *lemmata* serve to locate the exact place in the text which is being explained or to which reference is being made. Moreover, even though the author of the Bruges (and Erlangen) questions had a copy of the Moerbekian recension at his disposal, it would be most natural for him to draw his *lemmata* from the *versio communis* which was the standard text in use. The Moerbekian recension was for the author, as he himself says, the *alia* translation.

In view of the light they shed on medieval exegetical practice and their relation to Aquinas' in particular, it is desirable to attempt to date as closely as possible the composition of the anonymous Bruges (and Erlangen) questions. Unfortunately the date of the Moerbekian recension is not known; however, it could not have been made before 1260.<sup>15</sup>

A *terminus ad quem* can be determined with reasonable certainty from a statement in reply to the second objection of question 3 in Book I of the anonymous questions in which the author mentions that he does not as yet have a translation of Aristotle's *Poetics*.<sup>16</sup> The *Poetics*<sup>17</sup> were not translated into Latin before William of Moerbeke made his translation, which was completed on March 1, 1278.<sup>18</sup> If we assume that Moerbeke's translation would have reached the author of the Bruges (and Erlangen) questions within two years or so, we may date the questions before 1280. While it is true that Moerbeke's translation of the *Poetics* had a limited circulation (only two manuscripts survive), it is not unreasonable to suppose that our author would have obtained a copy within a not too lengthy period of time if one had been

<sup>14</sup> For the readings of the (unedited) Moerbekian recension I have used a photostatic copy of MS Paris, Bibl. nat., lat. 16080, fol. 95<sup>v</sup>-112<sup>v</sup>. For the opening sentence, see fol. 95<sup>v</sup>1-2. Extracts from this manuscript are printed in *Aristoteles Latinus: Codices*, pars posterior (Cambridge, 1955), pp. 792-793.

<sup>15</sup> See Minio-Paluello, 'L'ignota versione...', p. 393.

<sup>16</sup> [...tertia pars loyce que diuiditur]... et in poeticam quam tradit [Aristoteles] in quodam libello quem adhuc apud nos translatum non habemus. MS Erlangen, UB 213 (Irm. 485), fol. 84<sup>v</sup>a13-14. Cf. MS Bruges, Bibl. de la ville 509, fol. 59<sup>a</sup>a39-41.

<sup>17</sup> The "middle commentary" of Averroes on the *Poetics* had been translated at Toledo by Hermannus Alemannus in 1256. See *Aristoteles Latinus: Codices*, pars prior (Rome, 1939), pp. 212-213. Cf. Ezio Franceschini, 'Ricerca e studi su Aristotele nel Medioevo latino,' *Aristotele: nella critica e negli studi contemporanei* [= *Rivista di filosofia neoscolastica*, supplemento speciale al volume XLVIII, dicembre 1956] (Milan, 1957), p. 155.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. the explicit of the Toledo manuscript; see Erse Valgimigli, ed., *De arte poetica: Guillelmo de Moerbeke interprete*. *Aristoteles Latinus*, Vol. 33 (Bruges and Paris, 1953), p. 37 (*apparatus criticus*) and also p. vii.

available, since we do know that he used the Moerbekian recension of the *Posterior Analytics* which seems likewise to have had a restricted circulation (see note 5 above). Thus we may date the anonymous questions on the *Posterior Analytics* as composed sometime between 1260 and *ca.* 1280. If they were not written within the lifetime of Aquinas, they could not have been composed very long after it.

Our investigation has shown that Saint Thomas was not the only Aristotelian commentator to avail himself of William of Moerbeke's recension of the *Posterior Analytics*. His contemporary, the author of the Bruges (and Erlangen) questions, also took advantage of the work. From the point of view of chronology the author of these questions could be Boetius of Dacia, although no certain evidence of his authorship has yet been presented. These findings in no way bear upon the question of whether Moerbeke made his translations especially for Thomas.<sup>19</sup> If Moerbeke did not make all of his translations for Saint Thomas, he may nevertheless owe the initiation of his work to him. Our findings do show that at least one other expositor of Aristotle was sufficiently interested in grasping the precise meaning of the text to obtain a copy of the Moerbekian recension of the *Posterior Analytics*. Thus we see that Aquinas was not unique in this.

Toronto, Canada.

Bruce BRASWELL

## MINSHEU'S "GUIDE INTO THE TONGUES" AND SOMNER'S "DICTIONARIUM"

Some time ago, James L. Rosier published a brief study: "The Sources and Methods of Minsheu's *Guide into the Tongues*".<sup>1</sup> Deservedly, Minsheu's work is praised by Mr. Rosier. The latter, however, makes for the *Guide* two claims which are subject to question and will be discussed here.

In his article, Mr. Rosier writes that the "*Guide* is also of importance because of the considerable influence it had on later lexicographers" (pp. 68-69). Among these, the name of William Somner is tentatively included thus: "Somner was also presumably indebted to the *Guide* for Old English in his *Dictionarium Saxonico-Latino-Anglicum* (1659)" (p. 69). This suggestion is supplemented by the following footnote: Note the statement by Wanley in his *Catalogus*, "Guil. Minshaei Dictionarium XI Linguarum, cum magna copia vocum Saxonicarum, quas e regione adscripsit Guil. Somnerus."<sup>2</sup> Mr. Rosier makes no further comment on the precise relation between William Somner and the copy of Minsheu's work thus catalogued by Wanley.

<sup>19</sup> It is surely not without significance that Moerbeke continued his work of translation after Thomas' death. Cf., e.g., the date of his translation of the *Poetics*.

<sup>1</sup> James L. Rosier, "The Sources and Methods of Minsheu's *Guide into the Tongues*", *PQ*, 40 (1961), 68-76. Hereafter page references to this article will usually be given in parentheses, immediately after the quotation.

<sup>2</sup> Rosier, p. 69n. Wanley's statement occurs on page 272 of the *Catalogus Historico-Criticus* (Oxford, 1705).



However, an examination of the dictionaries of Minsheu and Somner raises a serious doubt that Somner could have "presumably" gained much from Minsheu's "Old English". For the "Old English" in *Guide into the Tongues* is, to say the least, very odd. This fact leads us to a consideration of Mr. Rosier's second claim for the *Guide*. He writes that Minsheu "frequently uses an Old English word to explain an etymology" (p. 68) and, later, that "Minsheu must have had access to a relatively large quarry of Old English words (perhaps one of the Old English-Latin manuscript vocabularies of the 16th century), because the illustrations of 'our old Saxon tongue' in the *Guide* are abundant" (p. 72). Indeed, Minsheu frequently gives in his etymologies a word labelled "Sax." or "S.", which as he explains are the abbreviations for "Saxon Tongue"<sup>3</sup>; Mr. Rosier seems to suggest that these "Saxon" words are to be identified with "Old English." A few examples, however, will suffice to show that, as Old English forms, they are often extremely questionable. The list given below is composed of entries which occur in both the 1617 and 1625 editions of the *Guide*; the entry number is also given.

|      |      |  |
|------|------|--|
| 1617 | 1625 |  |
| 936  | 1275 | a Beame of an house. Sax. Baume                    |
| 962  | 1306 | to Become, or beseeme. Sax. Bequemen, i. convenire |
| 1049 | 1414 | to Beseech or intreat. Sax. Besoken                |
| 1067 | 1435 | to Bethinke or premeditate. Sax. Bedencen          |
| 1393 | 1807 | a Brother. Sax. Bruder                             |
| 2951 | 3503 | Dead, or deceased. Sax. Dode                       |
| 2952 | 3504 | Deafe, or hard of hearing. Sax. Doff               |
| 3521 | 4185 | a Dreame. Sax. drom                                |
| 5116 | 5252 | Forbid. Sax. Vorboden                              |
| 5733 | 5981 | a Hauke. S. Hauic                                  |
| 5874 | 6200 | to Hire, to take to hire. Sax. hueren (1617-Hüren) |
| 7519 | 7167 | a Knee. S. Cnee                                    |
| 7634 | 7329 | to Leape. Sax. Lopen                               |

The list could be easily enough extended. Such "Saxon" words can hardly be called "Old English", yet, if we eliminate them from the *Guide into the Tongues*, Minsheu's "Old English" is very considerably diminished. This is not to insist that he never uses what can be called Old English. Acceptable examples occur here and there, also labelled "Sax." or "S.", but they certainly do not suggest "a relatively large quarry" nor familiarity with "one of the Old English-Latin manuscript vocabularies of the 16th century" if we may use that of John Joscelyn (BM Cotton MSS Titus A xv and xvi) as our criterion.

Comparing Minsheu's gleanings with the labouriously-constructed Old English word-list of William Somner, a word-list based on careful examination of Anglo-Saxon manuscripts and of newly-edited texts, we can hardly believe that Somner would turn for help to Minsheu's "Saxon." What is Wanley describing then in his *Catalogus* entry?

The following translation of his Latin statement suggests a solution:

William [*sic*] Minsheu's Dictionary of XI Tongues with a large supply of Saxon words which William Somner added opposite.

<sup>3</sup> Under the general heading: 'Notas quibus utimur sic intelligito,' Minsheu explains that 'S. and Sax.' are abbreviations for 'Saxon Tongue.' Both the 1617 and 1625 editions of Minsheu's work were used in preparing this article.



This would mean that Somner had jotted in the margins or elsewhere in the *Guide* many Anglo-Saxon words, perhaps simply taking advantage of Minsheu's alphabetical list of English words in order to see more readily possible etymological relations between contemporary English and his own Anglo-Saxon headwords.

Further investigation has proved this deduction concerning the "magna copia vocum Saxonicarum" and its location to be correct. The copy of Minsheu's *Guide*, which Wanley described, can still be found in the Cathedral Library, Canterbury. Mr. William Urry, Keeper of the Manuscripts, has very generously examined the volume, confirming the suggestion that the Old English words therein are, in fact, Somner's. Thus, Mr. Urry explains that the edition of Minsheu is "interleaved. On the extra leaves are large numbers of OE words in the hand of William Somner." With this information, he has kindly sent a photoprint of the leaf opposite columns 371 and 372 in the second edition (corresponding to the first column of page 242 in the earlier edition but with many additions). The photoprint is here reproduced.

Probably Somner's chief contribution to the study of the English language was the compilation of an extensive Anglo-Saxon word-list which provided later lexicographers with a solid foundation for examining the development of the language. Minsheu lacked such a list and his attempts to relate contemporary English to "Saxon" suffer accordingly. Somner is not indebted to Minsheu for Old English in his *Dictionarium*, and there is little doubt that the etymologies in the *Guide* would have been far more accurate if Minsheu himself could have benefited from the first printed Anglo-Saxon dictionary.

*St. Joseph College, West Hartford, Conn.*

Sister MARY JOAN, R.S.M.

## THOMAS WIMBLEDON

It is interesting to discover that the preacher of a late fourteenth-century Middle English sermon,<sup>1</sup> which is extant in sixteen different manuscripts<sup>2</sup> and numerous printed versions,<sup>3</sup> has never been exactly identified. To be sure, the preacher's surname, Wimbledon, is known from both manuscript and printed evidence. But there is confusion over his Christian name: according to one group of sources it

<sup>1</sup> *A Famous Middle English Sermon*, ed., K. F. Sundén (Göteborg, 1925). See also John Edwin Wells, *A Manual of the Writings in Middle English*, supplements 1-9, 9th supplement by B. D. Brown E. K. Heningham, F. L. Utey (New Haven, 1926-52), under "Redde Racionem Villicaonis Tue."

<sup>2</sup> MSS. Additional 37677; Cambridge University Library li. III. 8; Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, 357 (CC); Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge, 334/727; Harleian 2398 (HR); Hatton 57; Helmingham Hall L. J. II, 2; Helmingham Hall L. J. II, 9 (H9); Huntington Library 502; Pepys 2125 (P); Royal 18A XVII (RA); Royal 18B XXIII; Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge, 74 (SS); Trinity College, Cambridge, B. 14.38 (TC); Trinity College, Dublin, C. 5.7; University College, Oxford, 97.

<sup>3</sup> See *A Short-Title Catalogue of Books... 1475-1640*, compiled by A. W. Pollard and G. R. Redgrave (London, 1926), nos. 25824-25839.

was Thomas; according to another, R. or Robert.<sup>4</sup> Because no critical edition of the sermon, involving a collation of all the manuscripts, has been published, no one has ever brought together all the information bearing on the identification of this preacher. It is the purpose of this essay to assemble this evidence — some of it unpublished before — and to examine it in order to establish finally that the preacher of this sermon was, in fact, a Thomas Wimbleton, and to suggest other biographical details about the preacher.

The date of the sermon can be fixed with reasonable accuracy from the body of the text itself. Discussing the coming end of the world, the preacher observes that, "Þe grete Antecrist schulde come in þe fourteenþe hundred zeer fro þe birþe of Crist, þe whiche noumbre of zeeris is now fulfilled not fully twelue zeer and an half lackynge" (CC: fol. 280a).<sup>5</sup> Simple subtraction fixes the date at 1388 (New Style). While two manuscript notations offer 1389 or 1390 as alternative dates, the earliest date, 1388, seems most reasonable simply because it is mentioned in the text itself. About the place of delivery there is no question. Contemporary notes on five of the manuscripts<sup>6</sup> agree that the sermon was delivered at Paul's Cross, a famous preaching station<sup>7</sup> in St. Paul's Churchyard in London.

That the sermon was well-known and popular in the late fourteenth and fifteenth centuries is confirmed by the number of manuscripts in which a version of it appears (fourteen English and two Latin MSS). Its theme, taken from Luke 16:2, "Give an account of thy stewardship" revealed the punishments awaiting the man, lay or clerical, who had not fulfilled his appointed tasks within his proper social order. Like Langland, Wimbleton attacked the current abuses practiced by the three estates, particularly those of the clergy and knights. He urged every man to mend his ways in order to prepare for the final judgement which, according to Wimbleton, was to occur in 1400. The sermon must also have been popular in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries because it was printed twenty-three times between ca. 1550 and 1635. Apparently the printers of that time saw the sermon as an early reformatory tract, rather than as the distinctly medieval Catholic fare it was.

Many of the printed editions and some of the manuscripts attribute this sermon to a Wimbleton, to R., Robert, or Thomas. The possibility that the preacher was named Robert Wimbleton can, I think, be dismissed easily. The earliest printed version of the sermon to identify the preacher, in this case as R. Wimbleton, was included in Foxe's 1570 edition of *Actes and Monuments*.<sup>8</sup> All the printed editions from 1582 forward designate R. Wimbleton as the preacher. Nowhere does a printed edition assign the sermon to Robert Wimbleton. The only reference to

<sup>4</sup> Modern scholars have been similarly confused: Wells, 2nd supplement, p. 1057, cites a reference to Robertus Wimbleton; the *Short-Title Catalogue* lists the sermon under Wimbleton, R.; Sundén (pp. vi, xii) believes either Robert or Thomas possible. It should be noted, however, that A. B. Emden, in *A Biographical Register of the University of Oxford to A.D. 1500* (Oxford, 1959), III: 2120, identifies a Wymbledon, whose surname only appears in certain Merton College Records as Thomas Wymbledon; Mr Emden offers no proof of this identification.

<sup>5</sup> All MSS but H9 record this date.

<sup>6</sup> MSS H9, fol. 17a; P, fol. 73b; TC, fol. 127a; HR, fol. 140a; RA, fol. 184b.

<sup>7</sup> See John B. Marsh, *St. Paul's Cross* (London, 1892); Aymer Vallance, *Old Crosses and Lych-gates* (London, 1920).

<sup>8</sup> John Foxe, *Actes and Monuments*... (London, 1570), I, 653.

that name occurs in a sixteenth-century notation in a manuscript now unfortunately missing, MS. *Wells*: "Robertus wimbleton authore qui floruit tempore Henrici 4."<sup>9</sup> Other sixteenth-century notations in the manuscript texts of this sermon mention only R. Wimbleton: SS, "A Sermon no lasse godlie then learned preached... by R. Wymbeldon" (fol. 167b); P, "R. Wimbleton, his Sermon" (fol. 65b).

There is, however, one sixteenth-century manuscript note which identifies the preacher as Thomas Wimbleton: TC; "A Sermon Preach'd... by Tho: Wymbleton" (fol. 112b). And, according to an early seventeenth-century catalogue of the library of Henry Savile of Banke (1568-1617), the sermon is attributed to Thomas Wimbleton: "Sermo elegans in haec verba Redde rationem villicationis tuae. Luc: 16 cap: per Thomam Wimbeldon. Anglice" (MS. Additional 35213, fol. 30b). There are, as well, several manuscript notations in the hands of the original scribes which identify Thomas Wimbleton as the preacher. Immediately following the text in MS P (date: ca. 1400) is this note: "Sermo Thome Wymbeldone london predicator ad crucem in cimiterio ecclesie sancti Pauli" (fol. 73b). A similar *explicit* occurs in MS TC (fifteenth century): "Thomas Wymmyldown istum composuit sermonem ad crucem sancti pauli Londonensis. qui obiit in die omnium sanctorum amen. Ricardi tercii post conquestum XV. cuius anime propicietur deus amen" (fol. 127a). Elsewhere the sermon is introduced by references to Thomas: MS HR (fifteenth century), "Sermo magistri Thome Wymyldone apud crucem in cimiterio sancti Pauli Londonensis" (fol. 140a). Again, a similar note introduces the sermon in MS RA (fifteenth century): "This sermoun suyng was prechid atte Poulis crosse at two tymes of Maister Thomas Wymbiltone" (fol. 184b). From these manuscript notations, which represent the earliest evidence, and from corroboratory evidence in printed editions of the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, it appears likely that a man named Thomas Wimbleton, rather than R. or Robert, preached this sermon.

This identification of Thomas Wimbleton receives still more support from medieval civil and ecclesiastical records. In searching through all the published records dealing with Surrey (using Wimbleton, Surrey, as a starting point), Sussex, Middlesex, Hampshire, Berkshire, Wiltshire, Kent, and Yorkshire (Wombleton, Yorkshire), I found many entries which mentioned the Wimbleton family, or families. There were three principal sets of Wimbletons who flourished in the late fourteenth century: those from Surrey and Sussex, those from Hampshire, and those from Wombleton, Yorkshire. Records from Surrey contain references to Wimbletons as far back as 1212, and the family continues to flourish through the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries in Surrey, and in Sussex and Middlesex as well. The Hampshire Wimbletons seem to have become wool merchants of Andover as early as 1271. The Yorkshire Wimbletons appear much less frequently in the records than do the Southern families. I discovered only one late fourteenth-century reference to a Robert de Wymbilton, a man who owned land in Yorkshire in 1383.<sup>10</sup> As a land owner, thus a layman, he can be dismissed from this discussion. But several references to Thomas Wimbleton, a clerk, appear in *Wykeham's Register*:

Orders conferred by the bishop in his Chapel at Highclerk on Saturday 21 Dec. 1381.  
Acolyths... Thomas Wymbeldone.<sup>11</sup>

<sup>9</sup> See Wells, 2nd supplement, p. 1057.

<sup>10</sup> *Calendar of Close Rolls... Richard II*, 1381-85 (London, 1920), II, 339.

<sup>11</sup> Ed., T. F. Kirby (London, 1899), I, 300.

Orders conferred by the bishop on the eve of Trinity Sunday, 30 May 1382. Priests: Thomas Wymeldene, dio. Wynt.<sup>12</sup>

Preacher's License granted to ds. Thomas Wymbeldone, chaplain to sir John Sandes, kt: — ... Southwark, 28 April, 1385.<sup>13</sup>

It would be foolish to conclude that this man, or one of these men, mentioned in *Wykeham's Register* is necessarily the Thomas Wimbleton who preached the sermon at Paul's Cross in 1388. The records merely show that a clergyman, or clergymen, named Thomas Wimbleton was or were living during the decade 1380-1390.

Tantalizing references to Wimbletons appear throughout late fourteenth- and early fifteenth-century records of Merton College, Oxford. On folio 15 of the *Catalogus Vetus*<sup>14</sup> of Merton College, a Wymyldon is listed as a Fellow<sup>15</sup> of the college. Only the surname is given, but against the surname is this note: "Famosissimus predicator fuit in toto regno Anglie." This note may have been written as much as 150 years after 1388, and for that reason, cannot be relied on completely.<sup>16</sup> The Bursar's Accounts for November 1386 to March 1387 record "Wymbeldon"<sup>17</sup> as one of the Fellows whose names are entered for commons. The name occurs again in the accounts for November 1387 to March 1388.<sup>18</sup> The next records which survive, those for 1390, 1391, 1392, and 1395, contain no record of any Wimbleton. Mr A. B. Emden observed that, "It seems most unlikely that Wymbeldon, fellow of Merton, in 1386, can be equated with Dominus Thomas Wymbeldone, chaplain to sir John Sandes, kt., in the previous year, as the office of a private chaplain out of Oxford would not cohere with the requirements of his fellowship. Nor do I think Thomas Wymbeldone who was ordained acolyte 21 December, 1381, is the same man as Thomas Wymeldene who was ordained priest 5 months later: the interval is too short."<sup>19</sup>

One is haunted by the possibility that *the* Thomas Wimbleton was a man of University (Merton College) attainments — hence "Maister Thomas Wymbiltone" and "magistri Thome Wymyldone," (see above, p. 000), Master designating the graduate in Arts and the teacher of Theology<sup>20</sup> — and his sermon with its scholastic intricacies supports this hypothesis. There is also to be noted the obvious connection between Merton College and the county of Surrey. Merton College actually originated in Surrey and was transplanted from there to Oxford. If Thomas Wimbleton, assuming doubtfully that his origins were in Surrey, were going up to Oxford he could have most naturally entered Merton.

The next occurrences of the name Wimbleton in the Bursar's Accounts of Merton College are these: November 1398 to March 1399 — "Wymulton;" November 1399 — "Wymeldon;" undated, probably 1398 or 1399 — "Wymylden."<sup>21</sup> The

<sup>12</sup> I, 302.

<sup>13</sup> II, 370-71.

<sup>14</sup> Begun ca. 1420 by Thomas Robert, a Fellow of Merton.

<sup>15</sup> "In colleges chiefly devoted to the purposes of study and education, the Fellows were, in early usage, often included under the term *scholars*." *NED*, under *Fellow* (7a), p. 144.

<sup>16</sup> For this information and that which follows I am indebted to Mr. A. B. Emden of Oxford.

<sup>17</sup> Merton Records, 3715.

<sup>18</sup> Merton Records, 3716.

<sup>19</sup> In a letter to me, 16 October, 1956.

<sup>20</sup> Hastings Rashdall, *The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages* (Oxford, 1895), I, 21-22.

<sup>21</sup> Merton Records, 3722, 3724, 3725, respectively.

Subwarden's Accounts (Merton) for 1400-1401 contain an item for a mass of "Andr. Wymelton,"<sup>22</sup> from which it may be presumed that this man died about 1400. Bishop Braybrooke's "Register" (London) records that "Magister Andreas Wymbeldon" was ordained acolyte on 23 September, 1396; subdeacon, 17 March, 1397; priest, 22 December, 1397.<sup>23</sup> His designation to the title of his fellowship at Merton is recorded in the entries of 17 March and 23 December, 1397. This Wimbeldon cannot be the preacher of 1388 because he was not ordained until 1396-97, eight years after the sermon was delivered.

The statement which follows the sermon in MS TC, "Thomas Wymmyldoun... qui obiit in die omnium sanctorum amen. Ricardi tercii post conquestum XV" (see above, p. 000), sets All Saints' Day in the fifteenth year of the reign of Richard III as the date that Wimbeldon died. Since this Latin *explicit* was written by the original scribe in the early fifteenth century, the "Ricardi tercii" must be a scribal error for "Ricardi secundi."<sup>24</sup> The fifteenth year of the reign of Richard II was 22 June, 1391, to 21 June, 1392, and All Saints' Day in that period was 1 November 1391. It is notable that no other reference to Thomas Wimbeldon can be found after 1389.

All the evidence presented here indicates that there were several Thomas Wimbledons living in England in the decade 1380-90. In spite of this confusion, perhaps I can make a few tentative suggestions about Thomas Wimbeldon, the preacher. He was probably a Southerner, with origins in Surrey, Sussex, or Hampshire. It is likely that he was a Fellow of Merton College, Oxford, from 1386 to 1388. He was a well-known preacher who delivered in 1388 a sermon at Paul's Cross in London. He may have died on All Saints' Day in 1391. None of these statements can be proved, but this brief biography which I have guessed at does suggest that Thomas Wimbeldon, the preacher, was a schoolman and thus in the tradition of the other great scholar-preachers of the fourteenth century—Archbishop FitzRalph, Bishop Brunton, and the great Dominican Bromyard.

*University of Southern California*

Nancy H. OWEN.

## CHAUCER'S «THROSTIL OLD» AND OTHER BIRDS

Although Chauntecleer and his wife have been identified as Golden Spangled Hamburgs,<sup>1</sup> very rarely does Chaucer provide details which suggest that he has examined his birds with the interest of an ornithologist. There are, however, a few descriptions of birds which may be based on personal observation.

The explanations offered for "the throstil old" (*PF*, 364) are that the mistle thrush was supposed to live to a great age<sup>2</sup> and that it was believed to discard its

<sup>22</sup> Merton Records, 3975a.

<sup>23</sup> Guildhall Library MS 9531/3, fol. 42, 44, 46, respectively.

<sup>24</sup> While this mistake is difficult to explain, it should be noted here that there was no fifteenth year of the reign of Richard III, and that the king who preceded Richard II was Edward III.

<sup>1</sup> Lalia P. Boone, 'Chauntecleer and Partlet Identified', *MLN*, LXIV (1949), 78-81.

<sup>2</sup> F. N. Robinson, *The Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*, 2nd ed. (Boston, 1957), p. 795. (All quotations are from this edition).

old legs and acquire new ones when about ten years old.<sup>3</sup> But to turn to folklore to account for the adjective may be unnecessary. In "The Darking Thrush," Thomas Hardy notes the same aspect: "an aged thrush...". The fact is, with its beard-like white chest beneath its brown face, the bird looks old. The yellowish buff edges to its greyish brown back and rump<sup>4</sup> also give it a worn look. Similarly, in the case of the "frosty" feldefare (*PF*, 364), another member of the *turdidae* family which Chaucer adds to Alanus' list, there may be an allusion to the appearance of the bird. With its slate grey head, nape and rump contrasting with its chestnut back and blackish tail,<sup>5</sup> the fieldfare has a frosty appearance, particularly in flight, when the white axillaries and underwings are conspicuous.

An equally simple explanation may be given for "the fesaunt, skornere of the cok by nyghte" (*PF*, 357). Skeat suggests that Chaucer has transferred to the pheasant the qualities of Alanus' *gallus silvestris*, which is described as *domestici galli deridens desidiam* or he may be alluding to the fact that the pheasant will breed with the common hen.<sup>6</sup> T. P. Harrison considers the proposal that "just as the cock, Chanticleer, crows at dawn, so the pheasant crows at sunset before he climbs to roost," to be equally feasible.<sup>7</sup> The phrase "by nyghte" need not support the view that Chaucer is alluding to mating. It is possible that he is merely referring to the observable fact that although the wild pheasant will come and feed with domestic chickens around the barn during the day, at night, when the cock tries to herd it with the chickens into the barn to roost, it will refuse to obey. So, too, Chaucer may be considering what he has actually seen when he describes the swan as "jelous" (*PF*, 342). The swan's death song referred to in the same line is a common legend repeated by Alanus and others. It has some basis in fact because, in the whooper swan, *cygnus cygnus*, a flute-like, wailing sound arises as the last breaths are exhaled through the long, twisted windpipe.<sup>8</sup> But the swan with which Chaucer would be familiar is not the whooper swan, which is only a winter visitor in England, but the indigenous mute swan, *cygnus olor*, seen in the numerous swanneries, along the river banks and in the fenlands of medieval England.<sup>9</sup> Swans pair for life, and one ornithologist, remarking on the nesting habits of the birds, states:

A pair of swans are very jealous of their ownership [of the nest] and an intruder in the form of another swan is quickly driven away. On rare occasions a battle may be fought to the death.<sup>10</sup>

It seems, then, that "jelous" may be an independent designation, based on fact.

<sup>3</sup> T. P. Harrison, *They Tell of Birds* (Texas, 1956), p. 41, suggests that the superstition mentioned by C. Swainson, *Provincial Names and Folk Lore of British Birds* (London, 1885), p. 4, may account for the adjective.

<sup>4</sup> For description, see H. F. Witherby *et al.*, *The Handbook of British Birds*, II (London, 1943), 113.

<sup>5</sup> Witherby, II, 107-8.

<sup>6</sup> *The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*, I (Oxford, 1894), 519.

<sup>7</sup> *They Tell of Birds*, p. 40. The quotation is from "Bombadier", "Chaucer, Ornithologist." *Blackwood's Magazine*, CCLVI (1944), 125.

<sup>8</sup> Witherby, III, 169.

<sup>9</sup> For distribution of the whooper swan and the mute swan, see Witherby, III, 171, 177-8.

<sup>10</sup> David Armitage Bannerman, *The Birds of the British Isles*, VI (Edinburgh, 1957), 187.



In *The Parliament of Fowls*, although Chaucer subordinates Alanus' enumeration to his own artistic purpose, he assigns to the birds attitudes which usually reflect their traditional characteristics.<sup>11</sup> Elsewhere, using birds mainly to illustrate human behaviour, Chaucer frequently relies on commonplace ideas, proverbial phrases or literary sources. In three instances, however, Chaucer appears to be drawing upon his own observations. Alison's song, in *The Miller's Tale*, is described as being "as loude and yerne / As any swalwe sittynge on a berne" (3257-8). The swallow's song is a simple warbling twitter intermingled with a little throaty trill which seems full of spontaneous gaiety.<sup>12</sup> But it has very little carrying power, and one critic, ascribing ironic intent to Chaucer, believes that the swallow has no song.<sup>13</sup> It seems more likely that Chaucer, in seeking to describe the shrill chatter appropriate to his coltish, high-spirited heroine, is alluding to the loud, high-pitched "tswee" which the swallow makes when alarmed or excited.<sup>14</sup> Another brief simile introduces the goldfinch: "gaillard he was as goldfynch in the shawe" (*CkT*, I, (4367), and the subsequent description suggests that Chaucer is aware of an analogy between the apprentice and the bird with reference to appearance, behaviour and song as well as to temperament:

Broun as a berye, a propre short felawe,  
 With lokkes blake, ykembd ful fetisly.  
 Dauncen he koude so wel and jolily  
 That he was cleped Perkyn Revelour.  
 He was as ful of love and paramour  
 As is the hyve ful of hony sweete:  
 Wel was the wenche with hym myghte meete.  
 At every bridale wolde he synge and hoppe;  
 He loved bet the tavernne than the shoppe.  
 For whan ther any ridyng was in Chepe,  
 Out of the shoppe thider wolde he lepe —  
 Til that he hadde al the sighte yseyn,  
 And daunced wel, he wolde nat come ayeyn —  
 And gadered hym a meynee of his sort  
 To hoppe and synge and maken swich disport. (4368-82)

The goldfinch (*carduelis carduelis britannica*) has tawny brown feathers on its upper mantle, scapulars and back, and black on the back of its crown, the centre of the nape and hindneck.<sup>15</sup> Its flight is described as a "light, flitting and dancing action,"<sup>16</sup> and in courtship the male turns excitedly from side to side before the female, swaying the body.<sup>17</sup> It flutters butterfly-like from plant to plant, and hops.<sup>18</sup> It is very

<sup>11</sup> See Robinson, *The Works*, pp. 794-796 *passim*.

<sup>12</sup> H. F. Witherby *et al.*, *The Handbook of British Birds*, II (London, 1943), 227; Bannerman, *Birds of Brit. Isles*, III (Edinburgh, 1953), 376.

<sup>13</sup> D. S. Brewer, "The Ideal of Feminine Beauty in Medieval Literature," *MLR*, L (1955), 268.

<sup>14</sup> Witherby, *Handbook of Brit. Birds*, II, 227.

<sup>15</sup> *Id.* I, 60.

<sup>16</sup> *Id.* I, 58.

<sup>17</sup> Bannerman, I, 105; Witherby, I, 59.

<sup>18</sup> Witherby, I, 58.

gregarious,<sup>19</sup> and has been described by one ornithologist as "a sociable little bird, quick and engaging in its movements."<sup>20</sup> Chaucer may also be thinking of the bird when he stresses Perkyn's musical talents (4375, 4382, 4396). The goldfinch's song is described as "a pleasing liquid twittering elaboration of the ordinary call-note" and is said to recall that of the canary.<sup>21</sup>

Finally, in a further reference to the swan, Chaucer may again be relying on what he has actually observed. In *The Summoner's Tale*, Chaucer compares the gluttonous friars to Jovinian (1929-30). "Fat as a whale" is probably a very general reference to the large size and blubber of the whale,<sup>22</sup> but "walkynge as a swan" is a most apt description of the gait of a fat man. As one ornithologist observes, the swan "though a most elegant and beautiful creature on the water, is an extremely awkward walker on account of its very short legs and large body."<sup>23</sup>

The examples cited suggest that, although Chaucer relies much on tradition and on source for his references to birds, he sometimes includes or implies facts which he may have discovered for himself. It is to be noted that in the instances where he seems to make use of personal knowledge, the birds were common in medieval England, and all of them, including the fieldfare,<sup>24</sup> would have been seen even in London.

Victoria College, Toronto

Beryl ROWLAND.

## THE "ECLOGA THEODULI", THE "GENERAL ESTORIA", AND THE PERSEUS-BELLEROPHON MYTH

Though the tradition which associated Perseus with Bellerophon as a rider on Pegasus has long been of interest for the history of medieval and Renaissance mythology,<sup>1</sup> recent scholarship has overlooked the influence of the *Ecloga Theoduli* on

<sup>19</sup> *Id.* I, 58.

<sup>20</sup> Bannerman, I, 104.

<sup>21</sup> Witherby, I, 59.

<sup>22</sup> Cf. "Secunda Pastorum," *The Wakefield Pageants in the Towneley Cycle*, ed. A. C. Cawley (Manchester, 1958), I, 105, where Gib complains that his wife is "as greatt as a whall."

<sup>23</sup> Phyllis Barclay-Smith, *British Birds* (London, 1939), pp. 13-14. See also Bannerman, *Birds of Brit. Isles*, VI (Edinburgh 1957), 180.

<sup>24</sup> See Witherby, *Handbook of Brit. Birds*, II, 107.

<sup>1</sup> For a survey of the myth which "associates... the poet and the winged horse Pegasus," see Miss Mary Lascelles, 'The Rider on the Winged Horse,' in *Elizabethan and Jacobean Studies Presented to Frank Percy Wilson in Honour of his Seventieth Birthday* (Oxford, 1959), pp. 173-198. For the association of Perseus and Bellerophon as riders on Pegasus, see T. W. Baldwin, 'Perseus Purloins Pegasus,' *PQ*, XX (1941), pp. 361-370; George Burke Johnston, 'Johnson's 'Perseus upon Pegasus,' *RES*, ns, VI (1955), pp. 56-67; John D. Reeves, 'Perseus and the Flying Horse in Peele and Heywood,' *RES*, ns, VI (1955), pp. 397-399; Harold N. Hillebrand (ed.), *Troilus and Cressida, A New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare* (Philadelphia and London, 1953), pp. 45-47n. See also my note 'Perseus upon Pegasus and *Ovid Moralized*,' *RES*, ns, IX (1958), pp. 407-410. I am indebted to Miss Lascelles for a reference to Salomon Reinach's study 'Pégase. l'Hippo-griffe et les Poètes,' *Revue Archéologique*, 5th series, XI (1920), pp. 207-235.

the development and diffusion of this tradition. For medieval commentators, an ambiguous quatrain in the *Ecloga* accentuated the problem of the identity of the two heroes and their relation to the winged horse:

Gorgonis effigie mortalis vertitur ide,  
 Nam qui viderunt, lapides quasi diriguerunt.  
 Bellerophon monstro cum Palladis arte perempto  
 Comit equi pennas et se dimittit in auras.<sup>2</sup>

How were these lines to be interpreted? Did they refer to two distinct myths<sup>3</sup> — Perseus and the Gorgon, Bellerophon and the Chimaera — or to simply one legend? Was the “monster” of line 3 identical with the “Gorgon” of line 1, or an altogether different creature? This was a recognized *crux* for medieval exegesis, and the divided opinion of the commentators is reflected by Odo of Picardy, in his statement of the problem:

Hic pseustis ponit aliam fabulam et dicit quod mortales homines vertebantur a gorgone ita ut qui eam viderent rigorem lapidis contraherent [...] dicit praeterea quod bellorophon [*sic*] monstro devicto et perempto per artem palladis comit .i. ornat equum suum & volavit per aera. Sciendum est quod in hoc textu duplex potest esse lectura. Prima est ut in istis. iiii. versibus tantummodo tractetur una materia scilicet de perseo qui superavit gorgonem qui perseus alio nomine appellatur bellorophon ut inquit. Secunda lectura esset ut in duobus primis versibus tangatur fabula de perseo et gorgone in secundis de bellorophonte.<sup>4</sup>

Odo himself apparently preferred the second interpretation, for he treats the exploits of Perseus and Bellerophon separately. Although he describes the birth of Pegasus from Medusa's blood (“ex sanguine eius ortus est equus pegaseus alatus”) and interprets the winged horse allegorically as fame (“Per pegasus alatum et divinum illius bonam famam procedentem ab operationibus virtuosis intelligimus quae per totum mundum generaliter divulgatur”), he never declares that Perseus rode on Pegasus. The first interpretation, on the other hand, distinctly equates the two heroes (“perseus alio nomine appellatur bellorophon”), so that the final couplet would *a fortiori* mount Perseus on Pegasus (“Comit equi pennas et se dimittit in auras”).

<sup>2</sup> Joannes Osternacher (ed.), *Theoduli Eclogam* (Ripariae prope Lentiam, 1902), p. 44. For medieval interpretations of the reference to “Ida,” see *Theodolet* (Bruges, c. 1480), “Quand Yde print de gorgon la figure/ Bien sembloit mortelee creature...” Cf. Alfonso el Sabio, *General Estoria*, ed. Antonio G. Solalinde, Part II (Madrid, 1957), pp. 294-296, “la mortal yda es mudada por la paresçencia de Golgen, et los que la uieron assi se tornaron duros como piedras; et Bellerophon, matando a Gorgen con el arteria de Pallas, affeyto las pennolas del caualllo, e dexo se yr por el aer.”

<sup>3</sup> Osternacher, *Quos Auctores Latinos et Sacrorum Bibliorum Locos Theodulus Imitatus Esse Videatur* (Urfahr prope Lentiam, 1907), p. 31, interprets the text as meaning that both heroes rode on Pegasus: “Quomodo Bellerophon Pegaso vectus Chimaeram occidit, ita eiusdem equi auxilio Perseus feram marinam devincit...”

<sup>4</sup> *Theodolus cum Commento* (s.l., 1487). The same interpretation appears in later editions: *Ecloga Theodoli* (“Iudoci pelgrim & Henrici Jacobi,” 1508); *Theodoli cum Commento* (“wynandi de worde Londoniis,” 1515); *Autores cum Commento* (“Lugduni ab Eustachio Mareschal,” 1519). See Osternacher, ‘Die Ueberlieferung der Ecloga Theoduli’, *Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde*, XL (1915), pp. 331-376.

Odo's commentary is, however, relatively late in date (he died in 1415),<sup>5</sup> and the earlier commentary by Bernard of Utrecht does not mention the Perseus-Bellerophon equation.<sup>6</sup> Of greater significance for the development of this tradition is the explanation of this quatrain in the thirteenth-century *General Estoria* of Alfonso el Sabio.<sup>7</sup> The chapter "*Del cavallo Pegaso*" explicitly identifies Bellerophon as Perseus' and describes Pegasus as "el cavallo de Persseo." Thus the entire quatrain is interpreted as an account of Perseus' victory over Medusa:

Agora esta razon a mester esponimiento, e ell esponimiento es este: Gorgen dize aqui por Medusa... Daquello al, que dizen estos viessos adelant, que Belorofon mato al bestiglio con el arte de Pallas, Bellerophon es por el rey Persseo. Et esto es por lo que diximos aqui de como los sabios mudauan los nonbres a las cosas en sus estorias a lugares, por que dize aqui el maestro Bellerophon por Persseo, et dizo bestiglio por Gorgen...

Thus, for Alfonso, the "Bellerophon" of the *Ecloga* is no more than a sort of elegant variation for "Perseus," and the word "monstro" is likewise simply a "mudamiento de los nonbres" for the name "Gorgon." Hence the final lines allude to Perseus' flight on Pegasus:

Daquello al otrossi que dize el maestro, que affeyto Bellerophon las pennolas del cauallo, el cauallo fue aquel Pegaso de que dizen los autores que nascio de las gotas de la sangre que salie de la cabeça de Medusa. Mas el cauallo, e sus pennolas, e su uolar e leuar a Persseo por el aer non es otra cosa si non que dan a entender los sabios, que lo dixieron encubierta mientre por el cauallo, los bienes e las riquezas del reyno; las pennolas e el uolar que Persseo fizo, puzes que aquel reyno ouo, es que fue o quiso por el mundo, e cumplio lo que cometio con el poder daquel reyno, e desta guisa uolaua aquel cauallo e Persseo en el.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>5</sup> Osternacher, 'Ueberlieferung,' p. 333n.

<sup>6</sup> See British Museum MS Burney 251: Incipit commentum Bernardi in theodolum. The author is Bernard of Utrecht, not Bernard Silvester. For the confusion of these two figures, see Joseph Frey, *Ueber das mittelalt. Gedicht Theoduli ecloga und den Kommentar des Bernhardus Ultraiectensis* (Münster, 1904); Max Manitius, *Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters*, Part III (München, 1931), p. 195.

<sup>7</sup> The first four parts of the *General Estoria* seem to have been completed by 1280; see *General Estoria*, Part I (Madrid, 1931), p. xxii.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, Part II, pp. 294-296. Alfonso introduces the quotation from the *Ecloga* primarily to demonstrate that the names "Perseus" and "Bellerophon" are interchangeable and that Pegasus really is the horse of Perseus: "Este cauallo, a que los autores de los gentiles e las estorias llaman Pegaso, fue tan ligero que diz que semeiaua que uolaua, et, segunt cuentan Eusebio e Jheronimo, fue de una duenna. Palephato diz que fue una naf de Belorophon, pero todos los mas acuerdan que fue el cauallo de Persseo. E como quier que los sabios demudan los nonbres a lugares en esta razon en sus estorias, la razon daquel cauallo dicha la auemos en la estoria de Persseo; ma por la razon del mudamiento que dezimos de los nonbres departiremos ende aqui tanto en aquel libro, de que diximos ya en esta estoria que llaman en el latin Teodolo e en el romanz Theodoreth, sobre la contienda que auemos contado que tomaron Seustis e Aliçia..." Alfonso's statement that "todos los mas acuerdan que fue el cauallo de Persseo" indicates that the Perseus-on-Pegasus tradition must have become fairly wide-spread before 1280. His references to Eusebius and Palephatus are apparently derived from St. Jerome's *Interpretatio Chronicae Eusebii Pamphili* (PL. 27,

Other medieval commentators on the *Ecloga* treat the Perseus-Bellerophon association in less detail. A commentary ascribed to the thirteenth century places Perseus on Pegasus, but does not actually identify him with Bellerophon:

Et videns medusam eius caput amputavit. & de gutta quadam natus est pegasus equus alatus qui perseum per aera portavit.<sup>9</sup>

The two heroes are equated, however, in an interlinear gloss in a manuscript assigned to the second half of the fourteenth century; over the name "Bellofrons" in the text, the glossator has written "Perseus."<sup>10</sup>

Since the *Ecloga Theoduli* was used throughout Europe as "a primary textbook of reading in mediaeval schools,"<sup>11</sup> it undoubtedly contributed to the dissemination and diffusion of this tradition. Its influence on the development of the tradition is, however, more difficult to determine, for the passage still remains something of a *crux*. If one accepts Odo's "prima lectura" and assumes that the quatrain refers to "una materia," then the *Ecloga* would appear to be the earliest known example of the Perseus-Bellerophon equation<sup>12</sup> and the Perseus-on-Pegasus motif.<sup>13</sup> The work is "commonly assigned to the ninth century"<sup>14</sup> and therefore antedates the earliest known instances of the tradition.<sup>15</sup> On the other hand, if one subscribes to Odo's "secunda lectura" and assumes that the author of the *Ecloga* was consciously treating two distinct myths, there is a definite possibility that the Perseus-Bellerophon equation and the Perseus-on-Pegasus motif may have originated in a misinterpretation of this ambiguous quatrain.

Pasadena, California.

John M. STEADMAN.

226): Pegasus equus velocissimus cujusdam mulieris, sive ut Palaephatus scribit, Bellerophonti navis fuit.

<sup>9</sup> See Bodleian MS Auct. F. 5. 6, fol. 101. According to *A Summary Catalogue of Western Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library at Oxford*, this manuscript was "written late in the 13th cent. in England."

<sup>10</sup> See Bodleian MS Add. A. 171, fol. 34. *A Summary Catalogue* declares that this manuscript was "perhaps written in the second half of the 14th cent. in Italy."

<sup>11</sup> George L. Hamilton, 'Theodulus: A Medieval Textbook,' *MP*, VII (1909), pp. 169-185.

<sup>12</sup> Professor Baldwin (p. 364) has called attention to the identification of Bellerophon with Perseus ("Bellerophontis qui et Perseus") in the "tenth- or eleventh-century" manuscript of the Vatican "Mythographus Primus." Nevertheless, Perseus does not actually ride Pegasus in this account.

<sup>13</sup> A twelfth-century example of this motif occurs in Bernard Silvester's commentary on the *Aeneid*: Hic pegasus gutta cadente i.e. sanguinis effusione... oritur et Perseum ad diversa raptat i.e. nomen virtutis per universas nationes dilatat. See Guillaume Riedel (ed.), *Commentum Bernardi Silvestris super sex libros Eneidos* (Gryphiswaldae, 1924), p. 73. Bernard Silvester is alleged to have composed a commentary on the *Ecloga Theoduli* (Hamilton, p. 174).

<sup>14</sup> M. L. W. Laistner, *Thought and Letters in Western Europe, A.D. 500 to 900*, New Edition (London, 1957), p. 334. Laistner also observes, however, that "a strong case can be made out for placing it in the tenth [century]." See also Manitius, Part I (1911), pp. 536-574, Part II (1923), pp. 811-812; Karl Sprenger, 'Studien zur Karolingischen Dichtern,' *Neues Archiv*, XXV (1924), pp. 18-23; *Enciclopedia Italiana di Scienza, Lettere ed Arti* (Rome, 1937), s.v. *Teodulo*.

<sup>15</sup> Reinach suggested (p. 212) that Ovid's line: victor Abantiades alite fertur equo (*Amores*, III. xii) originally read: PER NOS BELLEROPHON, alite fertur equo, but this conjecture hardly seems plausible.

## THE "PRIORESS'S TALE" AND 'GRANELLA' OF 'PARADISO'

In the light of Professor Beichner's argument that the miraculous "greyn" of *The Prioress's Tale* may be a "grain of paradise," or cardamom,<sup>1</sup> it seems pertinent to reopen the question of the possible influence of the "story of Seth, who places three kernels or pippins under Adam's tongue at his burial." Though Professor Robinson finds "very little similarity between the two stories,"<sup>2</sup> the major points of resemblance that do exist do not seem insignificant. In both instances "grains" placed on or under the tongue of a person immediately before or after his death produce miraculous testimony to the Christian truth. In both cases they are bestowed by a heavenly agent. In both narratives they can be regarded (though in slightly different senses) as grains of paradise.

In the fourteenth-century *Leggenda d'Adamo ed Eva*, the angel of Paradise gives Seth "tre granella" [sic] with instructions to place them "in bocca sotto la lingua" at the time of Adam's interment. Shortly afterwards they produce three shoots — cedar, olive, and cypress — signifying the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. Until the time of Moses they remain in Adam's mouth without increasing or diminishing and without losing their verdure. Subsequently they grow into a single tree, which is eventually converted into the cross.<sup>3</sup> Though these kernels cannot, of course, be regarded as cardamoms, they are quite literally "granella" of "paradiso." They are, moreover, sent by an angel to the dying Adam, just as the Virgin bestows the "greyn" on the dying "clergeon." And just as the tongue of the murdered boy miraculously testifies in her honor, the mouth of the dead patriarch bears witness to the Trinity.

Admittedly there are some very important differences between the nature and effects of Chaucer's "greyn" and those of the *Leggenda's* "granella." The latter are three in number, whereas there is only one in *The Prioress's Tale*. The "tre granella" are seeds of cedar, cypress, and olive, whereas the "greyn" of *The Canterbury Tales* may be a cardamom. They are placed *under* Adam's tongue, but "upon" the tongue of the "clergeon." In the *Leggenda* they are deposited in the mouth only at the moment of burial and are not removed for several centuries, when they have grown into a tree; the grain of *The Prioress's Tale* is not only placed but removed before death, and it does not sprout. Though it miraculously prolongs the boy's life and enables him to sing even though his "throte is kut," the "tre granella" have no effect on Adam.

Nevertheless, these differences do not preclude the possibility that in describing the "miraculous object"<sup>4</sup> as a "greyn" — perhaps a grain of paradise — Chaucer

<sup>1</sup> Paul E. Beichner, C.S.C., 'The Grain of Paradise,' *Speculum*, XXXVI (1961), 302-307.

<sup>2</sup> F.N. Robinson (ed.), *The Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*, Second Edition (London, 1957), 736, "Skeat suggested that the idea may have come from the story of Seth..." Cf. Walter W. Skeat (ed.), *The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*, V. *Notes to the Canterbury Tales* (Oxford, 1894), 180, 491.

<sup>3</sup> Alessandro d'Ancona (ed.), *La Leggenda d'Adamo ed Eva, Testo Inedito del Secolo XIV* (Bologna, 1870), 17-29. See Robinson, 736, and Skeat, 180, 491, for references to English versions of the Seth-legend.

<sup>4</sup> Beichner, 302.

may have been influenced by the Seth-legend. They are to a very considerable extent attributable to the very different context of the grain-episode in the two narratives. The effects of the grain in the boy's mouth are obviously comparable to those of the lily and precious stones found in other versions of the legend of the murdered child;<sup>5</sup> apparently these effects were inherent in the story itself as Chaucer found it, and there was no reason for him to alter them. Hewas, after all, recounting a miracle of the Virgin, not retelling the legend of the Holy Cross. As they are two distinct tales, it is hardly suprising that his own treatment of the grain-motif differs radically from that in the Seth-legend.

Though he undoubtedly derived both the "idea" of a "miraculous object" on the tongue and the nature of its effects from an earlier version of the Prioress's story rather than from the tale of Seth, his identification of the object as a "greyn" — and perhaps a grain of paradise — is certainly closer to the story of the three "granella" than to the known analogues of his tale. In the absence of unmistakable evidence as to the object's identity in Chaucer's "source," Professor Beichner's argument reinforces the probability that Chaucer's "greyn" represents a slight modification of the original story under the influence of Seth's "granella" of "paradiso".

There is, moreover, a distinct possibility that the ambiguity of the word "greyn" may have been deliberate and that Chaucer did not intend his readers to choose one specific interpretation to the exclusion of all others. If so, one may agree with Professor Beichner that "the grain of paradise was as it were a grain from Paradise"<sup>6</sup> without rejecting Robinson's preference for "the explanation 'pearl'." Chaucer can hardly have been unaware of the vagueness of his term, yet he employs it consistently — four times in ten lines — without introducing a synonym or indicating what kind of grain it is. The obvious inference is that he did not intend a more precise identification, that he preferred the ambiguous generality to the clear specification. One reason for his apparently intentional vagueness may have been the ambiguity of the "miraculous object" in his source or (if he was utilizing more than one version of the tale) a possible conflict among his sources as to its nature. Other factors may have been primarily literary and aesthetic.

In the first place, by leaving the identity of the "greyn" uncertain, he succeeds in placing the primary emphasis not so much on the object as on the actual performer of the miracle. Had he specifically equated the grain with a cardamom, a gem, "a particle of the consecrated Host, or a prayer-bead,"<sup>8</sup> he could hardly have avoided shifting the emphasis slightly, but significantly, from "Cristes mooder swete" to the grain itself. Instead, by generalizing rather than specifying, he has subtly and delicately subordinated the role of the object in the story to that of the Virgin. In the second place, the very vagueness of the child's allusion to the grain is psychologically appropriate. It is in keeping with his extreme youth and childish "konnyng," the mortal nature of his wound, and his veneration of the Virgin, that he should not be over-precise or over-curious about the identity of the object placed in his mouth. And in fact Chaucer deliberately exaggerated the element of vagueness

<sup>5</sup> Robinson, 736; Carleton Brown, 'The Prioress's Tale,' in *Sources and Analogues of Chaucer's "Canterbury Tales,"* ed. W. F. Bryan and G. Dempster (Chicago, 1941), 457-458.

<sup>6</sup> Beichner, 307.

<sup>7</sup> Robinson, 736.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, 736.

by a qualifying phrase — "*Me thoughte she leyde a greyn upon my tonge.*" A child only "seven yeer of age," whose throat has been "kut unto [the] nekke boon" and who has just beheld a vision of the Madonna, could scarcely be expected to show much concern as to whether the grain placed in his mouth was a cardamom or a gem.

In the third place, the ambiguity of Chaucer's term enables him to exploit the very wide range of meanings and connotations associated with the word "greyn" — the grain of paradise, the "granela" of "paradiso" of the Seth-story, the grain of pearl, and the like. By sacrificing clarity he gains in suggestiveness. To have equated the object specifically and exclusively with any one of these possible meanings would have drastically curtailed its symbolic value by automatically eliminating all alternative interpretations. As the text stands, it is capable of evoking not only the "symbolic overtones" of the "name 'grain of paradise,'"<sup>9</sup> but also those of the pearl as "a recognized symbol of the Virgin,"<sup>10</sup> as a type of the heavenly reward of the blessed,<sup>11</sup> and as an emblem of virginity and innocence.<sup>12</sup> In the context of the narrative all three of these associations are potentially significant. The first is especially appropriate in view of the genre of the story — a miracle of the Virgin — and its central emphases — the "glorie" of "Jesu Crist" and "the worship of his Mooder deere." As it is she who is both efficient and final cause of the miracle — the giver of the miraculous grain and the theme of the miraculous song — it is fitting that the instrumental cause should be a symbol of her, that the "greyn" (like the Virgin herself) should be a "pearl *sine macula*."<sup>13</sup>

<sup>9</sup> Beichner, 303.

<sup>10</sup> Robinson, 736.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. Matthew xiii. 45-46, Rev. xxi. 21; Petrus Berchorius, *Reductorium Moralizationum super totam bibliam* (Cologne, 1477): Hoc exponitur a doctoribus. quod thesaurus et preciosa margarita fidem christi vel gloriam paradisi in agro scripturae latentem designant; *idem*, *Repertorium morale* (Nuremberg, 1489) *s.v.* *Margarita*: Vel etiam per margaritam intelligitur fides vel gratia dei. vel etiam gloria paradisi: qua .s. inventa debemus vendere omnia eam comparare." See also Charles G. Osgood (ed.), *The Pearl: A Middle English Poem* (Boston, 1906), 31-32, 82-83; W. H. Schofield, 'Symbolism, Allegory, and Autobiography in *The Pearl*,' *PMLA*, XXIV (1909), pp. 585-675.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. Berchorius, *Repertorium*, *s.v.* *Margarita*: Specialiter tamen margarita lapis est albidus in ventre conchilis concreatus: usitato vocabulo perla vocatus: medicine & ornatui deputatus: significans .s. virum iustum. & maxime virginem margaritam: album .s. et sinceram: & ornatui & medicine fidelium valde aptam. For the theme of innocence and virginity in *The Pearl* and for the symbolism of the pearl in Christian tradition, see Osgood, xxxii-xxxiii, 27-37, 82-83; Schofield, *op. cit.*; *idem*, 'The Nature and Fabric of *The Pearl*,' *PMLA*, XIX (1904), 154-215; Jefferson B. Fletcher, 'The Allegory of the Pearl,' *JEGP*, XX (1921), 1-21; D. W. Robertson, 'The Pearl as Symbol,' *MLN*, LXV (1954), 155-161; S. K. Heninger, Jr., 'The Margarite-Pearl Allegory in Thomas Usk's *Testament of Love*,' *Speculum*, XXXII (1957), 92 ff., Stanton de Voren Hoffman, 'The Pearl: Notes for an Interpretation,' *MP*, LVIII (1960), 73-80.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. E. Misset and W. H. I. Weale (eds.), *Analecta Liturgica*, Part. II. *The saurus Hymnologicus*, I (Insulis et Brugis, 1888), 351 ("Margarita pretiosa"); II (1892), 89 ("gemma primaria/sine contagio"), 446 ("Ave, caelestis margarita"). Schofield (*PMLA*, XXIV, 628) cites the *Coventry Shepherd's Play* ("Hail, pearl of pearls"), and Dunbar's *Ballad of Our Lady* ("Hail, purified Pearl"). Cf. *P.L.*, CLXXXIV, col. 1069, for a parallel in a work dubiously attributed to St. Bernard of Clairvaux; for a more elaborate comparison in the writings of St. Albertus Magnus, see Fletcher, 11-14.



Likewise appropriate in this context are the pearl's conventional associations with purity or innocence and with the glory of paradise. Though the Prioress herself gives explicit statement to these concepts in her references to the child's innocence (lines 566, 608, 635) and virginity (lines, 579, 609) and to his heavenly reward among the 144,000 virgins of the Apocalypse (lines 580 ff.), it is possible that (as in *The Pearl*) they may be signified implicitly and indirectly through the common symbol of a "perle wythouten spot." As the Scripture reading for the birthday of a virgin and martyr ("In natali unius virginis et martyris") includes the parable of the merchant "quaerenti bonas margaritas,"<sup>14</sup> a grain of pearl would be all the more suitable for this "martir, sowded to virginitee." A *margarita sine macula* in the clergeon's mouth would, accordingly, seem emblematic not only of the Virgin herself — the *object* of his "entente" — but also of the *quality* of his intent — its purity and its celestial reward. As the symbolic counterpart of the child's innocence and future reward in the company of the virgins, it appears to link his veneration of the Madonna in this life with the "song al newe" he shall sing in the next.

To conclude, it does not seem improbable that Chaucer may have consciously exploited the "symbolic overtones" of *both* types of "greyn" — the grain of paradise as well as the grain of pearl.<sup>15</sup> Had he intended to restrict its meaning particularly to either of these, he could easily have given an unequivocal statement of its identity. Line 662, for instance, could, without violence to the metrical pattern, have been phrased unambiguously — "Me thoughte she leyde a *perle* upon my tonge" or "She leyde a *greyn of parys* on my tonge." One can scarcely escape the inference that the vagueness of Chaucer's diction is intentional and that he left the nature of the "greyn" ambiguous for cogent literary and aesthetic reasons.

Pasadena, California.

John M. STEADMAN.

<sup>14</sup> *Missale ad usum... ecclesiae Sarum*, Part I. *Temporale* (Londinii, 1861), 722-723.

<sup>15</sup> For other symbolic meanings of the pearl "in the allegories of the Fathers," see Schofield, *PMLA*, XXIV, 635: "The pearl... represents 1. Christ; 2. the Virgin; 3. the saints; 4. those who enter into faith in the whiteness of all the virtues or are distinguished by one; 5. supreme knowledge of the Word; 6. the resurrection; 7. the eternal life; 8. the crown of every saint in heaven; 9. mysteries pertaining to the kingdom; 10. wisdom concerning God; 11. gospel teaching; 12. sweetness of the celestial life; 13. love of one's neighbor; 14. purity; 15. grace; 16. truth; 17. 'religio sancta, pura et immaculata'; 18. 'ourselves, whom we reclaim by giving all else in exchange,' etc." Other suggested interpretations of the "greyn" — that it may be a precious stone or a vegetable kernel — also possess associations with the Virgin, the heavenly kingdom, or the moral virtues. In the liturgy she is hailed as "granum sine palea" and as "gemma" (*Analecta Liturgica*, Part II, Vol. I, 89, 518-519; II, *Missale ad usum... ecclesiae Sarum*, Part I, 774, 874), and Berchorius (*Repertorium morale*, s.v. *Maria virgo*) compares her to various precious stones. The kingdom of heaven is "simile... grano sinapis" (Matthew xiii. 31-32; PL, 175, col. 793). According to Berchorius (*op. cit.*, s.v. *Gemma*): *Lapis preciosus signat merita vel virtutes*; and the Prioress herself applies the imagery of the lapidaries to the clergeon: "This gemme of chastite, this emeraude,/ And eek of martirdom the ruby bright".

## REPORT OF A THESIS RECENTLY DEFENDED AT THE PONTIFICAL INSTITUTE OF MEDIAEVAL STUDIES

*The Theology of the Hypostatic Union in the Early Thirteenth Century:  
The Doctrines of William of Auxerre, Alexander of Hales, Hugh of Saint-Cher,  
and Philip the Chancellor.*

WALTER H. PRINCIPE, C.S.B.

This thesis examines the development in the early thirteenth century of the theology of the Hypostatic Union; among contributions to this development between the years 1200 and 1240 it investigates directly those of William of Auxerre, Alexander of Hales, Hugh of Saint-Cher, and Philip the Chancellor. Since other contemporary authors of extant writings on the Hypostatic Union were considerably less influential than these four, they are not studied in themselves; however, because some of them have helped situate the teachings of the authors considered, their works, together with some from late twelfth-century theologians, have been used and quoted extensively so as to bring out the antecedent doctrinal situation. As a preliminary step this study required the edition of the pertinent texts of William of Auxerre, Hugh of Saint-Cher, and Philip the Chancellor. These editions, which are included in the thesis, complement the recently-published *Glossa in Quatuor Libros Sententiarum* and *Quaestiones Disputatae* of Alexander of Hales, whose texts on the Hypostatic Union are here analyzed as a whole for the first time.

The writings of these four representative and influential scholars fall roughly between the years 1215 and 1235. These years were important to the history of theology in general because during them new philosophical currents were beginning to influence theologians and significant changes in theological method were also taking place. As for the theology of the Hypostatic Union in particular, it was in this period that theologians, after lively debates and even papal intervention on one point, reached agreement on accepting the second of three opinions on the Hypostatic Union that had long been current in the schools. Described by Peter Lombard in his *Libri IV Sententiarum*, these three opinions have been named by modern scholars the Assumptus-Theory, the Subsistence-Theory, and the Habitus-Theory. Since much of the mediaeval theology of the Hypostatic Union revolved about these opinions, any evolution in their regard would necessarily be significant for the development of this theology; the evolution in this period and its significance are brought out in the thesis by parallel studies of the whole theology of the Hypostatic Union taught by William, Alexander, Hugh, and Philip.

### *The Editions*

Although there exist sixteenth-century printed editions of the *Summa Aurea* of William of Auxerre, their inaccuracy made a corrected text imperative for a study of his doctrine. Accordingly an edition is presented of the *Quaestio de Incarnatione* and the *Quaestio de Statu Christi in Triduo* from William's *Summa Aurea*: these contain his basic material on the Hypostatic Union. For this edition the Paris printed text

of 1500 was used and corrected from two thirteenth-century manuscripts: Basel, Univ.-Bibl. B. IV. 10, and Paris, Bibl. Nat. Lat. 15746; these sufficed both to provide a good working text and to establish certain useful conclusions about the various redactions of the work.

For Hugh of Saint-Cher the edited material comprises distinctions 2, 5-7, 10-12, and 21-22 of Book III of his *Scriptum super Sententiis*. This edition was based on three thirteenth-century manuscripts: Brussels, Bibl. Royale 1424, Bruges, Ville 178, and Vatican Lat. 1098. Both external and internal evidence in MS Stockholm, Kungl. Bibl. A 150, led to the conclusion that Hugh's text in this manuscript is not, as had previously been asserted, an earlier and therefore important new redaction of the work, but rather a summary of the ordinary version.

For Philip the Chancellor the only pertinent question in his *Summa de Bono*, the *Quaestio de Discretione Personali*, is edited from two thirteenth-century manuscripts: Padua, Anton. 156, and Toulouse, Ville 192. More important for this study and more extensive are his four questions on the Hypostatic Union found in MS Douai, Ville 434, an early thirteenth-century manuscript. One of these questions is identified for the first time as Philip's; his authorship of another, formerly hypothetical, is established with moral certainty. Some passages in these questions appear to be closely linked with texts in the second redaction of Book III of Alexander of Hales' *Glossa*. All four questions are edited in the thesis.

### *Main Conclusions*

The theology of the Hypostatic Union taught by William of Auxerre, Alexander of Hales, Hugh of Saint-Cher, and Philip the Chancellor manifests a general homogeneity tempered by many striking contrasts in detail. A requisite preliminary examination of the philosophical elements used by each theologian in his analysis of the Hypostatic Union makes evident the remarkable endurance of the essentialist philosophy of Boethius and his commentators: their philosophy of *quod est* and *quo est* is basic to much of the theology taught by these authors. At the same time the influence of the "new" Aristotle and of Avicenna shows itself, especially in Alexander and Philip, but also in William and Hugh. This new philosophy, besides providing particular principles and influencing their theological method, enters their theology of the Hypostatic Union by promoting an awareness of the level of nature or of concrete physical being as distinct from the logico-metaphysical level on which they usually move, by introducing concepts such as potency and act, substance and accident, or the four causes, and by providing definitions and classifications of union, unity, composition, and parts. In addition to these new philosophical authorities, one of the Greek Fathers, St. John Damascene, exercises a notable influence on all four authors, but especially on Alexander and Philip.

In the theology of the Hypostatic Union in the early thirteenth century one of the most important developments was that these authors finally systematized for their successors the understanding and presentation of the three opinions dominating this theological topic. William, Alexander, and Hugh now view these opinions in a changed perspective, seeing them mainly as answers to the questions whether Christ as man is "something" (*aliquid*) and whether especially Christ is one or two: all later authors will follow their interpretations of the opinions. Moreover, whereas before this period the three opinions, but chiefly the Assumptus-Theory and the Subsistence-Theory, were the subject of lively debate, all these influential authors support the second or Subsistence-Theory. Thus their personal influence (espe-

cially William's and Alexander's), together with their emphasis on the unity-duality problem and their insistence on the oneness of Christ, seem to have been decisive in finally establishing the second opinion or Subsistence-Theory, now modified from its twelfth-century meaning, as the common teaching.

As for the developments of particular points introduced by these authors, the contributions of Alexander of Hales are the most original and profound, but those of Philip the Chancellor are also outstanding. Alexander develops interesting arguments of fittingness for the Incarnation; both he and Philip introduce defences of the rational possibility of the union. In comparing angelic and human suitability for such a union Philip surpasses the others by comparing personal distinction in angels and men. William of Auxerre is influential by reason of his systematization of the three distinctions he finds necessary for personality; the third and decisive one, the distinction of dignity, plays a vital role for all these theologians in their explanation of the union in person. In Hugh of Saint-Cher, however, this approach leads to a concept of personality as mere negation of assumption by another; the same negative idea seems implicit in William of Auxerre's doctrine and in some texts of Alexander of Hales.

St. John Damascene's concept of "composed hypostasis" plays a considerable role in the analysis of the union made by Alexander, Hugh, and Philip; for example, it helps them express the physical reality of the union. The problem of how Christ is one rather than two is solved by all through their emphasis on Christ's unity of supposit linked with the distinction of *quod est* and *quo est* in ordinary human beings. Why Christ's two natures do not make him two occasions a variety of replies: William's concept of "quasi-accidentality," Alexander's use of Aristotle's definition of unity as undivided being; Alexander's and Hugh's teaching that the natures are united in real being; Hugh's use of the important concept of unity of *esse*. Further, these theologians make more explicit the notion that the union is a real created relation of the human nature to the divine person or nature. Alexander and Philip institute comparisons between the union in Christ and the kinds of union or unity listed by Aristotle. All four authors develop the concept of the grace of union by viewing it not only as God's free giving but as the very union itself in Christ, freely given by God; in addition, Alexander and Philip see the grace of union as a disposition in the human nature of Christ for the union, a disposition, however, that is distinct from habitual grace.

Again, these theologians contribute notable analyses of the terms "assume," "to be incarnate," "unite," and "to be united," and they show which may be used of the divine nature, which of the divine person. They all defend the reality of Christ's human nature as well as the union of body and soul in Christ. In discussing what was soon to be called the "communication of idioms," they develop and clarify the leading principles; some, however, admit a "quasi-twofold" supposition that confuses the issue. Philip the Chancellor's rules, however, are practically those of modern theology.

Thus these early thirteenth-century authors were significant not only because they transmitted to their successors the acquisitions of their own predecessors, but also because they introduced many innovations such as those just indicated. Their theology of the Hypostatic Union, in its unity and its individual differences, is important in its own right; moreover, the work of the great theologians of the next generation is fully comprehensible only when it is seen as the continuous development and further perfection of the theology of the Hypostatic Union as taught by these, their immediate predecessors.